THE INTERPRETATION OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN
IN THE GNOSTIC "GOSPEL OF TRUTH"
A Study in the Development
of Early Christian Theology

by

WILLIAM RHAME NELSON

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF THEOLOGY

Princeton, New Jersey

1963

PREFACE

An attempt to turn the pages of history back to the middle of the second century is a task which is indeed difficult. The writer is living in the twentieth century with the full benefit of all the understanding of the Christian faith which has been accumulated since the writing of the New Testament. For this reason it is not easy to think of a time when the New Testament was simply a fresh collection of writings which had not yet been subjected to the theologizing of every succeeding generation. In spite of a desire to be objective, it is not possible to see the early Church of the second century without looking through eyes which have been trained to perceive a certain way.

The writer comes to this task with an appreciation for Biblical theology and an interest in the early Church. He acknowledges his indebtedness to Professor Otto A. Piper of the Princeton Theological Seminary who has guided this investigation along an arduous path on which professor and student have walked together toward the desired goal of completion. At his suggestion a Fulbright Grant was applied for and received for the purpose of studying at the University of Heidelberg during the academic year 1959-1960. Having been introduced to the Coptic language by Professor Bruce M. Metzger of the Princeton Theological Seminary, this year in Germany provided the opportunity to continue the study of Coptic under the guidance of Professor Eberhard Otto and Dr. Gerhard Fecht of the Faculty of Egyptology in Heidelberg. Many profitable hours were also spent listening to Professors Günther Bornkamm and K. G. Kuhn of the

Faculty of Theology. During the year abroad, consultations on the proposed project were held with Professor Gilles Quispel in Utrecht, Professor Hans-Martin Schenke in East Berlin, and Professor Alfred Adam in Bethel bei Bielefeld. Upon returning to the United States, the project was discussed with Professor W. C. van Unnik when he was lecturing at Princeton Seminary in May of 1961. It was also a rare privilege to attend a Seminar on Gnosticism at Princeton University under the leadership of Professor Hans Jonas in the Fall of 1961.

In acknowledging the help and encouragement which has come from such diverse places, the writer is made aware of his own limitations. Nevertheless, this investigation has been carried out in the hope that it will add to the growing understanding of Christian theology in the formative stage of its development. This study of the past also has implications for the future. At this point the writer holds to what has been called a "boatman philosophy," i.e. sitting backwards in the boat in order to oar forward. In other words, by studying the past a clearer vision is gained concerning the problems of the future. The fact that the theology of the early Church was subjected to a thorough-going existential interpretation as early as the middle of the second century may come as a surprise to many. This development is clearly revealed in a comparison of the Gospel of John and the Gnostic "Gospel of Truth" (A complete English translation of this newly discovered Gnostic text is contained in the Appendix). Since this same approach finds contemporary expression in the theology of Rudolf Bultmann, the present study is more than an academic discipline of the past. It will also point the way to a better understanding of Christian theology for the future.

The research embodied in this study was carried out in Princeton, New Jersey, and Louisville, Kentucky. The writer wishes to thank Dr. Kenneth S. Gapp, Librarian of the Speer Library of the Princeton Theological Seminary, and Dr. Leo T. Crismon, Librarian of the Boyce Centennial Library of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, for graciously providing the facilities and the tools for the project. The environment at Princeton Seminary has been greatly enriched by frequent conversation with fellow graduate students, Cullen I. K. Story and Gerald L. Borchert, who are working in the same area of Christian Gnosticism. A word of appreciation also goes to the Clinton Avenue Baptist Church of Trenton, New Jersey, for allowing their pastor to have the freedom to complete his studies. Finally, the untiring devotion and sacrificial labors of my wife Colleen have provided the inspiration to complete the investigation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE ii

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS xi

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER

I. A NEW SOURCE FOR THE STUDY OF GNOSTICISM 8

- The Discovery of the Manuscript 8
  - The Gnostic Library of Nag Hammadi 8
    - Codex I 10
    - Codex XIII 10
    - Codices II - XII 11
  - The Prospectus of the Jung Codex 12
    - Size 12
    - Language 12
    - Contents 13
- The Life and Teaching of Valentinus 15
  - A Sketch of his Life 15
  - A Summary of his Authentic Teaching 19
    - Cosmology 20
    - Anthropology 22
    - Christology 26
- The Problem of Authorship 28

CHAPTER PAGE

The External Evidence of Irenaeus 29

Origin 29

Date 31

Structure 31

Purpose 32

The Internal Evidence of the Homily 33

Author 33

Style 34

Contents 37

Early Valentinus 40

Late Valentinus 43

Non-Valentinian 46

Title 49

II. A COMPARISON OF THE LEADING IDEAS 54

The Father 61

The Continuous Work of the Father 62

The Father and His Children 65

The Doctrine of God 69

The Son 74

The Father and the Son 75

The Only Son of God 77

The Logos 79

The Spoken Word/s of Christ 80

The Revealed Word 81

CHAPTER PAGE

The Spirit 88

The Metaphysical Usage 88

The Psychological Usage 90

The Mediatorial Usage 92

The Name 101

The Revelation of the Father 102

The Response of Man 111

The Truth 116

The Greek Usage 117

The Christian Usage 122

III. A CONTRAST OF THE WAY OF SALVATION 133

The Predicament of Man 143

Rebellion Against God 143

Sin 143

Unbelief 145

Forgetfulness of Man's Origin 147

Error 148

Ignorance 152

The Redemptive Work of Christ 154

Earthly Saviour 154

The Mission of Christ 155

Saviour 155

One Who Has Been Sent 156

Light 157

The Ministry of Christ 158

Signs 159

CHAPTER PAGE

- Sayings 160
- The Passion of Christ 161
  - Defeat of Satan 161
  - Glorification of the Son 162
  - Fulfilment of the Divine Purpose 164
- Heavenly Messenger 166
  - The Mission of Christ 166
    - Saviour 166
    - One Who Emanates 170
    - Light 174
  - The Ministry of Christ 177
    - Teacher 177
    - Teaching 183
  - The Passion of Christ 188
    - Defeat of Error 188
    - Recovery of Man's True Existence 191
    - Man's Reabsorption into the Divine 195
- The Appropriation of Eternal Life 200
  - Faith 200
    - Faith and Knowledge 203
    - Faith and Love 208
    - Faith and Life 211
  - Knowledge 215
    - Knowledge and Love 225
    - Knowledge and Life 232

CHAPTER PAGE

IV. A NEW LOOK AT EARLY CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY 246

A Comparison of the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth 252

Similarities Between the Two Documents 252

The Use of A Common Vocabulary 253

Leading Ideas 253

Subsidiary Aspects 255

Johannine Terms 263

Gnostic Terms 266

Miscellaneous Terms 269

The Absence of a Logical Progression 277

Differences Between the Two Documents 278

The Development of Doctrine 279

Cosmology 279

Christology 281

Anthropology 284

Soteriology 287

Eschatology 289

The Continuity with the Old Testament 290

The Relationship Between the Gospel of Truth and Valentinianism 294

The Authentic Teaching of Valentinus 295

A Comparison with the Gospel of Truth 295

Cosmology 295

Christology 297

Anthropology 298

An Evaluation of Current Research 300

CHAPTER PAGE

The Fully Developed Valentinian System 304

A Comparison with the Gospel of Truth 305

Cosmology 305

Anthropology 306

An Evaluation of Current Research 307

The Relationship Between the Gospel of Truth and Existentialism 310

The Existentialism of the Gospel of Truth . . . 310

Self-Understanding of the Present 310

Dehistoricizing of the Past 311

Demythologizing of the Future 313

The Existentialism of Rudolf Bultmann 314

Self-Understanding of the Present 315

Dehistoricizing of the Past 317

Demythologizing of the Future 322

APPENDIX 328

BIBLIOGRAPHY 356

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

I. REFERENCE WORKS

Arndt-Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon*	William R. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature: A Translation and Adaptation of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur, Fourth Revised and Augmented Edition, 1952.*
Bible Key Words	J. R. Coates, *Bible Key Words, from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. I and II. D. M. Barton, P. R. Ackroyd, and A. E. Harvey, *Bible Key Words, from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. III.
G. A. Butrick's *I. D. B.*	G. A. Butrick, *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, 4 Vols.
W. E. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary*	W. E. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary, Compiled with the Help of Many Scholars*.
J. Hastings's *E. R. E.*	James Hastings, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, 12 Vols.
G. Kittel's *T. W. N. T.*	Gerhard Kittel und Gerhard Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, 6 Bände.
Moulton-Geden, *Concordance*	W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, *A Concordance to the Greek New Testament*.
Pauly-Wissowa's *R. E.*	A. F. von Pauly and G. Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 23 Bände.

II. FESTSCHRIFTEN

R. Bultmann's *Festschrift* I	*Festschrift Rudolf Bultmann zum 65. Geburtstag*.

W. E. Crum's *Festschrift*	*Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum*.
C. H. Dodd's *Festschrift*	*The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology*, edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube in Honor of C. H. Dodd.
J. R. Harris's *Festschrift*	*Amicitiae Corolla: A Volume of Essays Presented to James Rendel Harris on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday*, edited by H. G. Wood.
A. Jülicher's *Festschrift*	*Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher zum 70. Geburtstag*.
Otto A. Piper's *Festschrift*	*Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper*, edited by William Klassen and Graydon Snyder.

III. PERIODICALS

Aust. B. R.	*Australian Biblical Review*
B. A.	*Biblical Archaeologist*
Bib.	*Biblica*
Bib. Sac.	*Biblica Sacra*
B. Z.	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
Cah. Bib.	*Cahiers bibliques de Foi et Vie*
Can. J. T.	*Canadian Journal of Theology*
Chr. Schol.	*Christian Scholar*
East. Ch. Q.	*Eastern Church Quarterly*
Ev. T.	*Evangelische Theologie*
Exp.	*Expositor*
Exp. T.	*Expository Times*
Gnom.	*Gnomon*
Interpr.	*Interpretation*

Isl.	Islam
J. B. L.	Journal of Biblical Literature
J. E. H.	Journal of Ecclesiastical History
J. Rel.	Journal of Religion
J. Rel. T.	Journal of Religious Thought
J. Sav.	Journal des Savants
J. T. S.	Journal of Theological Studies
Mus.	Muséon
Ned. T. Ts.	Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift
N. T. S.	New Testament Studies
Num.	Numen
Or.	Orientalia
Or. Suec.	Orientalia Suecana
R. Bib.	Revue Biblique
Rech. Sc. Rel.	Recherches de Science religieuse
Rel. Bib.	Religion och Bibel
Rel. L.	Religion in Life
Rev. Et. Gr.	Revue des Études grecques
S. B. O.	Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse.
Scot. J. T.	Scottish Journal of Theology
So. Re.	Social Research
St. T.	Studia Theologica
Th. Bl.	Theologische Blätter
Th. Tijd.	Theologisch Tijdschrift
T. L. Z.	Theologische Literaturzeitung

T. Ru.	*Theologische Rundschau*
T. Tod.	*Theology Today*
T. Z. Bas.	*Theologische Zeitschrift, Basel*
Vig. Chr.	*Vigilae Christianae*
Z. Kg.	*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*
Z. N. T. W.	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
Z. syst. Th.	*Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie*
Z. Th. K.	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*

INTRODUCTION

Two of the most startling archaeological discoveries of our time occurred shortly after the end of the second World War in the arid countries of Jordan and Egypt. One of these, the Dead Sea Scrolls, is widely known throughout the world of scholarship. From the time of their first discovery in 1947 at Qumrān in Jordan, the Dead Sea Scrolls also aroused the interest of the general public due to the publication of certain sensational theories regarding the relation of these documents to the origins of Christianity. The result has been a consistent flow of books and articles, ranging from detailed scholarly analyses based on minute studies of the texts to more or less popular presentations.

Very different was the fate of another discovery, the Gnostic library found some two years earlier at Nag Hammadi in Upper Egypt. Compared to the widespread interest in the Qumrān documents with "journalists rushing in where scholars fear to tread," the significance of the Nag Hammadi documents has scarcely been popularized at all. Moreover, it is quite unlikely that any sensation will arise from the publication of these texts. Perhaps this can be explained to some extent by the relationship of the two discoveries to Christianity. On the one hand, the date of the Dead Sea Scrolls was open to discussion and caused questions to be raised about the possibility of an influence upon Christianity at a formative stage of its development. On the other hand, the Nag Hammadi texts can be definitely placed in the Christian era, making the possibility of an influence upon

Christianity considerably more remote. Whereas the Dead Sea Scrolls throw new light on intertestamental Judaism and on Christian beginnings, the Gnostic library of Nag Hammadi does something comparable for subsequent Christian development. The real importance of the latter discovery lies in the light which it sheds on the history of Gnosticism.

The vast spiritual movement which is labeled "Gnosticism" is often described as "one of the most obscure points in the history of Christianity" or "one of the dimmest chapters in Church History." Any elementary textbook of Church History will comment about the special preoccupation of Church thinkers during the second century with the "Gnostic" heresies, in the course of which a firmer and clearer presentation of Christianity emerged. Yet the sudden appearance of these systems in the polemical literature of the second century has continued to challenge scholars from one generation to another. In spite of much energetic study and critical ingenuity, the complexities which surround the study of Gnosticism are largely due to the limited nature of the source material, consisting largely of the polemical and therefore biased accounts of the Church Fathers. Up to about 120 years ago the two Patristic sources which provided the main information about the Gnostics of the sub-Apostolic age were the *Adversus Haereses* of Irenaeus (c. A.D. 180) and the *Panarion* of Epiphanius (c. A.D. 374). The Patristic evidence was substantially increased in 1842 by the discovery of the *Philosophumena* (also called the *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*) of Hippolytus (c. A.D. 230).

The limited nature of these secondary sources was eventually balanced by the discovery of three obscure codices which were written by the Gnostics themselves. First of all, a Coptic manuscript (Codex Askewianus, London) dating from the second half of the fourth century contained the *Pistis*

Sophia ("Faith-Wisdom") and a treatise on penitence.[1] Secondly, another Coptic manuscript (Codex Brucianus, Oxford) dating from the fifth or sixth centuries contained the two Books of Yeu and a work without a title.[2] Thirdly, another Coptic manuscript (Codex Berolinensis, Berlin) dating from the fifth century contained the Apocryphon of John, the Wisdom of Jesus, and part of the Gospel of Mary.[3] In spite of the obscurity of much of the teaching, these three codices are important because they provided for the first time direct and authentic evidence of the Gnostic tenets as put forward by their adherents instead of by their opponents.

A great deal of effort has been expended in attempting to reconstruct the original teaching of the Gnostics from the scanty fragments preserved by the Church Fathers and to evaluate the significance of the later Coptic treatises. Although the need for further evidence was apparent from the beginning, the possibility of filling in some of the gaps has become a reality only since the discovery of the Nag Hammadi library in 1945. Almost overnight, the original sources for the study of Gnosticism, consisting of three codices containing about seven different writings, were augmented by the addition of thirteen codices containing at least fourty-four separate writings, thus providing the scholarly world with an almost unbelievable wealth of primary source material. For this reason the discovery of the Gnostic library of Nag Hammadi is giving rise to a great revival of interest in Gnosticism which will continue to grow as more and more of the new texts are translated and published.

---

[1] M. G. Schwartze and J. H. Petermann, *Pistis Sophia: opus gnosticum Valentino adiudicatum e codice manuscripto coptico Londinensi descriptum* (Berlin: F. Dümmler, 1851). Cf. G. Horner, *Pistis Sophia, Literally Translated from the Coptic with an Introduction by F. Legge* (London: S. P. C. K., 1924) (hereafter abbreviated G. Horner, *Pistis Sophia*).

[2] E. C. Amélineau, *Notice sur le papyrus gnostique Bruce: Text et traduction* (Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1891). Cf. Carl Schmidt and Walter C. Till, *Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften: Die Pistis Sophia, Die Beiden Bücher des Jeû, Unbekanntes Altgnostisches Werk*, 1. Band (2. Aufl.; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954) and Charlotte A. Baynes, *A Coptic Gnostic Treatise Contained in the Codex Brucianus* (Cambridge: University Press, 1933) (hereafter abbreviated C.A. Baynes, *A Coptic Gnostic Treatise*).

[3] Walter C. Till, *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1955). The task of editing the Apocryphon of John was enriched by the accessibility of another version of the document in the Nag Hammadi library; cf. Walter C. Till, "The Gnostic 'Apocryphon of John'," *J. E. H.*, 3 (1952), 14-22.

Although the initial discovery occurred some two years before the now famous Dead Sea Scrolls came to light in 1947, the publication of the Gnostic documents has been proceeding at a much slower pace. Only in the last seven years has the impact of the discovery made itself felt throughout the scholarly world. The delayed stimulus was brought about by the sumptuous publication of the Evangelium Veritatis ("Gospel of Truth")[4] and the subsequent publication of the Gospel of Thomas,[5] the first two documents of the new Gnostic library to be thoroughly edited by an international team of scholars. Some preliminary work has also been done on the Gospel of Philip and the Hypostasis of the Archons.[6] Thus, it is now becoming apparent that the Nag Hammadi library is comparable in importance to the Dead Sea Scrolls and of even greater significance to students of the New Testament. The full recognition of this fact will come only after each of the new documents in the Nag Hammadi library has been published and evaluated.

---

[4] E. M. Malinine, H.-C. Puech, and G. Quispel, Evangelium Veritatis: Codex Jung f. VIII - XVI (p. 16-32) / f. XIX - XXII (p. 37-43) (Zürich: Racher Verlag, 1956) (hereafter abbreviated E. M. Malinine, Evangelium Veritatis). Cf. Kendrick Grobel, The Gospel of Truth: A Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel, Translated from the Coptic and Commentary (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960) (hereafter abbreviated K. Grobel, The Gospel of Truth).

[5] A. Guillaumont, H.-C. Puech, G. Quispel, Walter C. Till, and Yassah 'Abd Al Masih, The Gospel According to Thomas (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959). Cf. R. M. Grant and D. N. Freedman, The Secret Sayings of Jesus, with an English Translation of the Gospel of Thomas by William R. Schoedel (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1960).

The present study is an attempt to show the influence of one book of the New Testament on the teaching contained in one document belonging to the history of Gnosticism. The two disciplines of the Christian religion and the Gnostic religion come in close contact in the Fourth Gospel and the Gospel of Truth, that is, in one of the later documents of the New Testament and one of the earlier documents of Gnosticism. Although the use of Johannine terminology in the Gospel of Truth is clearly discernable, this investigation is not concerned primarily with the literary dependence of the Gospel of Truth upon the Gospel of John. The main issue is that of discerning the way in which the author of the Gospel of Truth uses the theology of the Fourth Gospel to suit his own particular purpose. The extent to which the Gnostic teaching of the Gospel of Truth represents an adequate or inadequate reinterpretation of the Gospel of John will expose the similarities and differences in the thought of the two documents. The similarities will illustrate the way in which Gnostic thought develops under the influence of

---

[6] H.-M. Schenke, "Das Evangelium nach Philippus: Ein Evangelium der Valentinianer aus dem Funde von Nag-Hammadi," *T. L. Z.*, 83 (1958), 481-496; R. M. Grant, "The Mystery of Marriage in the Gospel of Philip," *Vig. Chr.*, 15 (1961), 129-140; E. Segelberg, "The Coptic-Gnostic Gospel According to Philip and its Sacramental System," *Num.*, 7 (1960), 189-200; C. J. de Catanzaro, "The Gospel According to Philip," *J. T. S.*, 13 (1962), 35-71; and H.-M. Schenke, "Das Wesen der Archonten: Eine gnostische Originalschrift aus dem Funde von Nag-Hammadi," *T. L. Z.*, 83 (1958), 661-670. Cf. J. Leipoldt and H.-M. Schenke, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften aus den Papyrus-Codices von Nag Hammadi* (Hamburg: H. Reich, 1960).

Christianity. The differences will illustrate the need which arose in the early Church for controlling the development of early Christian theology. It has long been recognized that the Fourth Gospel was the favorite Gospel of the Valentinian Gnostics and that it was also very influential in the molding of early Christian theology. For this reason a study of the interpretation of the Gospel of John in the Gospel of Truth may lead to a better understanding of the formative stages of both Christianity and Gnosticism.

In order to introduce the reader to the Gospel of Truth, Chapter I will deal with the discovery of the manuscript, the life and teaching of Valentinus, and the problem of authorship. In Chapter II the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel will be approached from the standpoint of comparing the main Johannine ideas which are used in the Gospel of Truth, i.e. the Father, the Son, the Logos, the Spirit, the Name, and the Truth. In Chapter III the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel will be continued from the standpoint of contrasting the way of salvation in the two documents, giving special attention to the predicament of man, the redemptive work of Christ, and the appropriation of eternal life. In Chapter IV the Gnostic interpretation of the Fourth Gospel will be evaluated with respect to the development of early Christian theology.

The scope of the present study is necessarily limited to one aspect of the influence of the New Testament upon one phase of Gnostic thought. It is not an attempt to evaluate the influence of Gnosticism upon the entire New Testament or to reconstruct the early history of Valentinian Gnosis. Yet the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth are both weighty documents which contain the essential ingredients of Christianity and Gnosticism. When the thought of one is compared with the other, the element of contrast will expose the underlying mentality of both documents and will illustrate the basic cleavage between Christianity and Gnosticism which is already apparent in the middle of the second century. It is hoped that this investigation will shed some light upon "one of the most obscure points in the history of Christianity" and upon "one of the dimmest chapters in Church History."

CHAPTER ONE

A NEW SOURCE FOR THE STUDY OF GNOSTICISM

From the works of various Christian writers between the second and fourth centuries it is evident that the early Church was forced to fight a great battle against a succession of adversaries known as "Gnostics." The conflict was unusually ferocious in the second century when the Church was faced with a life and death struggle for survival. It is now possible to see this situation in much clearer focus because of the discovery of the Gospel of Truth. After a brief sketch of the discovery of the manuscript, the life and teaching of Valentinus will be discussed in order to set the stage for a consideration of the problem of authorship. A survey of the current research with respect to this newly discovered Gnostic writing will provide the basis for a probable conclusion concerning the provenance and date of the document.

I. THE DISCOVERY OF THE MANUSCRIPT

The mysteries surrounding the discovery and acquisition of the Nag Hammadi library rival those contained in the documents themselves. Consideration will be given first to the library in general and then to the Jung Codex in particular.

(1) The Gnostic Library of Nag Hammadi. The information which has been collected in one way or another points to an ancient cemetery at the foot of a steep mountain, Gebel et-Tarif, on the east bank of the Nile near el-Qasr

es-Sayyâd (ancient Sheneset-Chenoboskion) in the region of Nag Hammadi as the place of the discovery. Nag Hammadi is a thriving Egyptian city (population 4400 in 1908) about 300 miles south of Cairo or 32 miles north of Luxor in the area formed by the eastward bend of the Nile (It was in this vicinity that St. Pachomius began his monastic community in the fourth century A.D.). However, the exact location of the manuscript deposit is still unknown since the area at the foot of Gebel et-Tarif is honeycombed with caves and tombs.

The date of the discovery seems to have been in 1945. Although the first of the codices did not reach the Coptic Museum in Cairo until October, 1946, the conversations which Jean Doresse[7] had with peasants in the area caused him to decide upon 1945 as the probable year of the discovery. The first press notice of the find is said to have appeared in the Cairo papers on January 11 and 12, 1948.

The discovery was apparently made by peasant laborers who for some reason were making an excavation in the cemetery of Gebel et-Tarif. Without archaeological intent they accidentally stumbled upon a large jar filled with thirteen leather-bound codices (i.e. books, not scrolls as in the case of the Qumrān documents which were also preserved in jars). Nothing remains of the jar itself since it was probably broken in the attempt to retrieve the codices inside of it. After examining the meaningless bundle of papyrus leaves, all that remained intact was quietly sold to a merchant who was willing to risk three Egyptian pounds ($8.50) on them, and no one in the village thought any more about it.

---

[7] Jean Doresse, *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics* (London: Hollis and Carter, 1960), pp. 116-136, esp. p. 128, a translation of *Les livres secrets des Gnostiques d'Égypte* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1958) (hereafter abbreviated J. Doresse, *Secret Books*). Cf. A. Adam, "Die gnostischen Schriften von Nag' Hammâdi," *Gnom.*, 34 (1962), 222-224.

It is at this point that the story begins to get complicated. The whole library of thirteen codices, written on about a thousand leaves of papyrus, soon became separated into three bundles.

(a) Codex I[8] dating from the third or fourth centuries contained five distinct writings, one of which was the Apocryphon of John, and was acquired by Togo Mina for the Coptic Museum in 1946.

(b) Codex XIII dating from the fourth century also contained five writings, one of which was the Gospel of Truth, and was sold to the Belgian antiquary Albert Eid in 1946. While Togo Mina was attempting to buy this manuscript for the Coptic Museum, it made its way to Europe on the mysterious path that is known only to the antique dealers of the Near East. After long negotiation, it was eventually secured through the efforts of Gilles Quispel[9] for the C. G. Jung Institute of Zürich in May, 1952. To honor the late psychiatrist who had long shown an interest in Gnosticism, this manuscript was named the "Jung Codex" and was made public at a ceremony in

---

[8] The numbers used are from the 1949 inventory of Jean Doresse, Secret Books, pp. 137-145, which served as a basis for the subsequent survey articles of H.-C. Puech. Cf. H.-C. Puech, "Les nouveaux Écrits Gnostiques découverts en Haute-Égypte (Premier inventaire et essai d'identification)" in W. E. Crum's Festschrift (1950), pp. 91-154, and H.-C. Puech, "Gnostische Evangelien und verwandte Dokumente" in E. Hennecke, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung, 1. Band, Evangelien, herausgegeben von W. Schneemelcher (3. Aufl.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959), s. 158-271.

[9] The negotiation is described in considerable detail by G. Quispel, "The Jung Codex and Its Significance" in The Jung Codex: A Newly Recovered Gnostic Papyrus, translated and edited by F. L. Cross (London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., 1955), pp. 40-44 (hereafter abbreviated F. L. Cross, The Jung Codex).

Zürich on November 15, 1953.[10]

(c) Codices II - XII dating from the third and fourth centuries contained the remaining thirty-nine writings of the Gnostic library, including the Gospel of Thomas, the Gospel of Philip, and the Hypostasis of the Archons in Codex X as well as two more versions of the Apocryphon of John in Codices II and X. A collector in Cairo named Miss Dattari obtained possession of these codices and offered to sell them to the Coptic Museum in 1949, but it was not until 1952 that they were acquired.

In this way all the codices (except Codex XIII) came to rest in the Coptic Museum where they are now being prepared for publication by an international team of scholars under the leadership of the current Director, Pahor Labib. One volume of photographic reproductions containing "the Apocryphon of John," "the Gospel of Thomas," "the Gospel of Philip," and "the Hypostasis of the Archons" from Codex X has already appeared.[11] This is, however, only the beginning of the total project, since the library contains forty-nine works, of which at least forty-four are separate treatises. Furthermore, it has been agreed to transfer the Jung Codex at some future date to the Coptic Museum so that the whole Nag Hammadi collection will be together in one place.[12]

---

[10] G. Quispel and H.-C. Puech, "Der Codex Jung," Ne. Zü. Z., 15. November, 1953, Sonntagsausgabe, Nu. 2708, Blatt 4; 16. November, 1953, Morgenausgabe, Nu. 2716, Blatt 4, and Abendausgabe, Nu. 2724, Blatt 12. Cf. H.-C. Puech, "The Jung Codex and the other Gnostic Documents from Nag Hammadi" in F. L. Cross, The Jung Codex, pp. 11-34.

[11] Pahor Labib, Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo, Vol. I (Cairo: Government Press, 1956) (hereafter abbreviated P. Labib, Coptic Gnostic Papyri).

[12] W. C. van Unnik, Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings: A Preliminary Survey of the Nag Hammadi Find (London: S. C. M. Press, 1960), esp. p. 12, a translation of Openbaringen uit Egyptisch Zand (The Hague: Uitgeverij van Keulen N. V., 1958), also translated into German as Evangelien (continued next page)

(2) The Prospectus of the Jung Codex. Having sketched the main facts pertaining to the discovery of the thirteen codices, it is now fitting to describe the main features of the specific codex in which the Gospel of Truth is found. Unlike the majority of manuscripts found at Nag Hammadi, the Jung Codex is distinctive in terms of size, language, and contents.

(a) Size. The Jung Codex is strikingly different from the other codices of the Gnostic library in that it is tall and narrow instead of short and broad. The pages of this Codex XIII are 29 cm. high and 14 cm. wide (c. 11½ x 5½ in.), whereas Codices I - XII are on an average of 25 cm. high and 15 cm. wide. The pages of Codex XIII are covered with writing in a single column which is 24 cm. high and 95. cm. wide (c. 9½ x 3 3/4 in.) which for the most part commands admiration for its regularity, clarity, and beauty. The codex itself consists of a series of papyrus leaves which are stitched together and frequently numbered. Unfortunately the binding of supple leather which resembles a modern portfolio has disappeared since the time of its discovery.

(b) Language. The Jung Codex can also be distinguished from the majority of the other codices in the collection by the Coptic dialect in which it was written (Coptic is the language which receives literary expression in the second century A.D. and represents the last stage in the speech of ancient Egypt). Codex XIII is written in Subakhmimic (A^2), the dialect which belongs to Middle Egypt, whereas the other codices (except part of Codex VIII) are written in Sahidic, the dialect of Upper Egypt. Because

---

(footnote 12 continued) aus dem Nilsand: Mit einem Beitrag "Echte Jesusworte?" von Johannes B. Bauer und mit einem Nachwort "Die Edition der koptisch-gnostischen Schriften von Nag'Hammadi" von Walter C. Till, in addition to appendices containing translations of "Das Thomas-Evangelium" by Hans Quecke, "Das Evangelium der Wahrheit" by H.-M. Schenke, and "Das Apokryphon des Johannes" by Walter C. Till (Frankfurt: H. Scheffler, 1960) (hereafter abbreviated W. C. van Unnik, Gnostic Writings).

of the limited area in which the Subakhmimic dialect was in use, this copy of Codex XIII was probably made in the region of Assiout, north of Akhmim, and brought up the river about 100 miles to Nag Hammadi at a later time. There are some dialectical peculiarities in this Codex which distinguish it from all other A^2 documents.[13] This divergence may be explained, however, by the fact that all the previously known A^2 documents are either orthodox Christian or Manichean; this is the first Christian Gnostic document in Subakhmimic which has been published. In all probability each of these religious groups had traditional linguistic mannerisms of its own.

(c) Contents. Another distinctive feature of the Jung Codex is the type of Gnosticism which is represented in it. Codex XIII consists of writings which belong solely to the Valentinian school, whereas the majority of the other codices belong to the more or less related sects of the Barbelo-Gnostics or the Sethians. The latter type of Gnosticism is well represented by the Apocryphon of John in Codices I, II, and X, whereas the former is limited to the four main writings of Codex XIII: a) *the Apocalypse of James* (pp. 1,1 -16,29) consisting of a dialogue between Christ and a few disciples after His resurrection; b) *the Gospel of Truth* (pp. 16,30-43,24, of which pp. 33-36 were missing at the time of publication)[14] consisting of a theological essay or homily whose theme is the salvation of man by means of the knowledge of his divine origin in the Father; c) *the Discourse to Rheginos* (pp. 43,25 - 48 end, of which the concluding section is missing) consisting of a short treatise in an epistolary form on the spiritual state of man's resurrection-life; and d) *the Treatise on the Three Natures* (pp. 51,1 - 134 end, of which the beginning and pp. 59 - 90 are missing) consisting of a long dogmatic exposition which deals with the problems of theology, cosmology, anthropology, and philosophy of history from a Gnostic point of view.[15] All of these works in the Jung Codex are products of the Gnostic school founded by the Egyptian Valentinus in the second century. It has been tentatively suggested that "the Discourse to Rheginos" and "the Gospel of Truth" were written by Valentinus himself and that "the Treatise on the Three Natures" is the work of his pupil Heracleon.

---

[13] M. Malinine, *Evangelium Veritatis*, p. x, discusses the peculiarities of the dialect of the *Gospel of Truth* and finds that it has much in common with an Akhmimic version of the First Epistle of Clement in Berlin which is dated in the middle of the fourth century by Carl Schmidt, *Der erste Klemensbrief in altkoptischer Übersetzung* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1908), S. 10, and with a Subakhmimic translation of the Gospel of John in London which is precisely dated in the third quarter of the fourth century by Sir Henry Francis Herbert Thompson, *The Gospel of John According to the Earliest Coptic Manuscript* (London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt, 1924) (hereafter abbreviated Herbert Thompson, *The Gospel of St. John*). This is the paleographical evidence for dating the Subakhmimic version of the Gospel of Truth in the second half, probably toward the end, of the fourth century A.D. Cf. V. Stegemann, *Koptische Paläographie* (Heidelberg: F. Bilable, 1936).

[14] The deluxe edition of M. Malinine, *op. cit.*, contains full-size photographic facsimiles, the text in Coptic type, and French, German, and English (continued next page)

(footnote 14 continued) translations, as well as extensive notes and a glossary of Coptic and Greek words. Except for the full-size photographic facsimiles, the same extensive work has been applied to the single lacuna of two papyrus leaves which are in the Coptic Museum - M. Malinine, H.-C. Puech, and G. Quispel, *Evangelium Veritatis (Supplementum): Codex Jung f. XVII - f. XVIII (p. 33-36) (Zürich: Racher Verlag, 1961).* Small-size photographic facsimiles of these missing pages can be found in P. Labib, *Coptic Gnostic Papyri*, p. 41-44. Cf. H.-M. Schenke, "Die fehlenden Seiten des sogenannten Evangeliums der Wahrheit," *T. L. Z.*, 83 (1958), 497-500; Walter C. Till, "Die Kairener Seiten des 'Evangeliums der Wahrheit'," *Or.*, 28 (1959), 170-185, and Walter C. Till, "Das Evangelium der Wahrheit: Neue Übersetzung des vollständigen Textes," *Z. N.T. W.*, 50 (1959), 165-185. The first English translation of the missing pages appeared in K. Grobel, *The Gospel of Truth*, pp. 138-172.

[15] H.-C. Puech et G. Quispel, "Le quatrième écrit gnostique du Codex Jung," *Vig. Chr.*, 9 (1955), 65-102; H.-M. Schenke, "Vom Ursprung der Welt: Eine titellose Abhandlung aus dem Funde von Nag-Hammadi," *T. L. Z.*, 84 (1959), 243-256; and H. Quecke, "Eine weitere Seite der koptisch-gnostischen 'Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Welt," *Mus.*, 72 (1959), 349-353. Moreover, the Jung Codex also contains a short fifth writing which is probably a "Prayer of the Apostle Peter" on one loose leaf of papyrus which has been badly damaged. Cf. G. Quispel in F. L. Cross, *op. cit.*, pp. 45-61, and J. Doresse, *op. cit.*, pp. 236-239.

The possibility that the Gospel of Truth was written by Valentinus calls for a consideration of the life and teaching of this Gnostic leader. It is only on the basis of this information that the problem of the authorship of the document can be discussed intelligently.

II. THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF VALENTINUS

The life and teaching of Valentinus, like most of the Christians of the second century, are concealed in a deep historical shadow. The secondary accounts of the Church Fathers must be relied upon exclusively for information about his life.[16] This means that a great deal of their work is colored by a polemical bias. The result is that only the worst features of their opponents are usually emphasized. The situation is not completely one-sided with respect to the teaching of Valentinus because of the authentic statements of this Gnostic teacher which have been preserved by Clement of Alexandria. The views of Valentinus are obviously better reflected in his own authentic statements than in the developed system which largely represents the work of his followers.

(1) A Sketch of his Life. It seems that Valentinus was born in Lower (northern) Egypt about A.D. 100-110, probably in a Greek-speaking family in spite of his Latin name. What appears to be the first accurate account of his birthplace comes from Epiphanius (*Pan. Haer.*, XXXI, 2) who specifies

---

[16] The best summary of the Patristic evidence for reconstructing the life of Valentinus is given by A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*, Teil I: *Die Überlieferung und der Bestand*, 2. erweiterte Aufl. mit einem Vorwort von Kurt Aland (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1958), S. 174-184. Since so much depends on the reliability of the views of the Fathers, Harnack quickly points to Irenaeus (whose information Tertullian, Hippolytus, and Epiphanius rely heavily upon for their understanding of Valentinianism) and Clement of Alexandria as the main sources for the life of Valentinus and insists that all the others contain information which is only of a "secondary nature" (*zweiten Ranges*).

that his native home was on the "coast of Egypt" (τῆς Αἰγύπτου παραλιώτης). The formative years of his life were spent in the city of Alexandria where he received a thorough Hellenistic education in Greek literature and science. Although nothing is said about when he became a Christian, it appears that he was already teaching in Egypt toward the end of Hadrian's reign (c. A.D. 130).

A desire to find a wider field for his activity as a teacher led Valentinus to Rome. The information given by Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.*, III, 4,3) appears to be trustworthy when he says that Valentinus "flourished" or "reached his peak" (ἤκμασε) at Rome in the time of Bishop Pius (c. A.D. 140-155) and remained there until the time of Anicetus (c. A.D. 155-165).[17] The implication is that he came to Rome during the time of Hyginus (c. A.D. 136-140), the immediate predecessor of Pius, and continued to teach until Anicetus became Bishop of Rome in A.D. 155.

The time that Valentinus spent in Rome from about A.D. 136-155 seems to have been within the framework of the Church. Just from the standpoint of disseminating his views more freely, it would be quite natural for Valentinus to remain in rapport with the Church and to disguise any peculiarly heretical tendencies by clothing them in the language of the Christian faith. Perhaps this approach gradually caused his relation with the Church to become more and more strained until a definite decision had to be made when, at the death of Hyginus, he became a candidate for the episcopal office in Rome. In view of the unusual freedom which he exhibited in interpreting the Christian faith, Valentinus was passed over in favor of Pius who had the "higher claim" (*praerogativa*) of having been a Confessor, i.e. one who had suffered for the faith without losing his life. Tertullian (*Adv. Valent.* 4) insists that it was for this reason that Valentinus broke with the Church. This break, however, does not appear to have been decisive or final, because Tertullian (*Praescr. Haer.* 30) adds that Valentinus and Marcion had been "cast out (of the Church) once and again" (*semel et iterum ejecti*). If Valentinus had been ejected only twice, it means that he must have been readmitted once. The implication is that at this one time at least the Christians at Rome had no serious misgivings about his orthodoxy. In fact, Tertullian (*Ibid.*) himself is quick to admit that "both as to talent and eloquence he was an able man."

---

[17] Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.*, VII, 17, 106) agrees with this chronology when he reckons Valentinus among heretical leaders in the time of Hadrian (A.D. 117-138) and places him between Basilides and Marcion. Tertullian (*Praescr. Haer.* 30) puts him along with Marcion in the time of Antoninus Pius (A.D. 138-161), but when he further states that Valentinus was an orthodox member of the church under the Episcopate of the Blessed Eleutherus (A.D. 175-189), he is evidently confusing Eleutherus either with Hyginus or with Pius. Later writers such as Eusebius (*Chronicon ad Ann. Abrah.* 2153 and 2159; *Hist. Eccl.*, IV, 11), Jerome (*Chronicon ad Ann. Abrah.* 2156 and 2159), and Theodoret (*Haer, Fab.*, I, 7) merely repeat the statement of Irenaeus referred to above.

In reality, no definite conclusions can be reached about the time when Valentinus's break with the Church took place, nor how it happened, nor how long Valentinus continued to teach in Rome as a heretical Christian. Nevertheless, it is certain that the time which he spent in Rome was quite sufficient for him to have set up a school there. His two most brilliant pupils were Ptolemy and Heracleon. Therefore, it is not surprising to learn that a group of Valentinians soon formed in the West (Rome, Italy, and Southern Gaul) who were known as the "Italic School" with Ptolemy, Heracleon, and Secundus as leaders. At the same time an "Anatolian School" was also formed in the East (Egypt and Syria) by Axionicus and Bardesanes and their successors, Theodotus and Alexander.

Before his death in about A.D. 160 Valentinus apparently left Rome and taught somewhere farther East, perhaps on Cyprus. Epiphanius (*Pan. Haer.*, XXXI, 2) probably exaggerates when he says that during his exile on the lonely island of Cyprus Valentinus "made a last shipwreck of his faith" (ὡς ναυάγιον τῆς πίστεως ἐξέστη), perhaps meaning that he gave a fresh turn to his doctrine after finding himself away from the great cities of Alexandria and Rome in which he had previously spent his life.

The main impression gathered from the Patristic evidence concerning the life of Valentinus is that of a gradual development within him away from orthodox Christianity. E.C. Amélineau[18] suggested the very interesting hypothesis that Valentinus elaborated his system in Egypt and went to Rome in order to impose it upon the faithful members of the orthodox Church. Even if this is so, his teaching did not immediately develop into a stage that would be offensive to the Christian faith since he was later considered as a candidate for the Episcopate in Rome. It is quite likely that Valentinus advanced toward his later position by a natural process of reflection which would have been stimulated by the speculative atmosphere of the Alexandrian Church. Accordingly, at the end of his teaching days he was likely indulging in speculations which would have been foreign to his earlier days.

---

[18] E. C. Amélineau, *Essai sur le Gnosticisme égyptien: ses développements et son origine égyptienne* (Paris: E. Leroux, 1887), p. 172. Although he grossly exaggerated the "preponderant influence of Egyptian doctrines" on the Valentinian system in order to prove his point, Amélineau correctly pointed out the indebtedness of Gnostic thinkers to Egypt for their theory of the Pleroma, of the birth of the Aeons by a process of emanation, and of the "syzygies" or pairs of male and female gods (pp. 291, 326-327). More recently, the deeply rooted Egyptian tendency to understand the world in dualistic terms as a series of contrasting pairs balanced in unchanging equilibrium has been pointed out by Henri Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature* (Chicago: University Press, 1948), p. 19 and 350, notes 12-13, and John A. Wilson, *The Burden of Egypt: An Interpretation of Ancient Egyptian Culture* (Chicago: University Press, 1951), p. 17.

If the evidence of the Church Fathers concerning the life of Valentinus has been interpreted correctly, there seems to be justification for distinguishing at least three stages in his development: a) *Valentinus the orthodox Christian* with tendencies toward daring expression in the speculative atmosphere of Alexandria and in the more restrained atmosphere of orthodoxy in Rome: b) *Valentinus the speculative Christian* of doubtful acceptability to the Church during the height of his influence as a teacher in Rome; and c) *Valentinus the heretical Gnostic* with a tendency to freedom of interpretation in opposition to the restraints of orthodoxy during his exile from Rome in the East. These three stages could be reconstructed with more certainty if more original source material from Valentinus himself had been preserved by the Church Fathers. Since this is not the case, they can only be tested by the teaching of the six authentic statements from this Gnostic leader which have been preserved by Clement of Alexandria (c. A.D. 190-202).

(2) A Summary of his Authentic Teaching. Eugène de Faye[19] was the first to use the authentic statements of Valentinus which have been preserved by Clement of Alexandria as the pivotal center for understanding Valentinus's Gnostic teaching. Instead of relying upon the biased accounts of Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, and Epiphanius for his understanding of Valentinus, de Faye insisted that the image of the Gnostic writer which comes forth

---

[19] E. de Faye, *Gnostiques et gnosticisme: Étude critique des documents du gnosticisme chrétien au II^{me} et III^{me} siècle* (2^{me} éd. augmentée; Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1925), pp. 154-174 (hereafter abbreviated E. de Faye, *Gnostiques*). Growing out of his earlier work, *Introduction à l'étude du gnosticisme au II^{me} et au III^{me} siècle* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1903), de Faye's comprehensive treatment of "Gnostics and Gnosticism" introduced a new method for the study of Gnostic sources by systematically distinguishing between the authentic fragments of the Gnostics themselves and the biased accounts of the Church Fathers. Cf. Paul Monceaux, "Les Gnostiques" (Review Article of E. de Faye, *Gnostiques*), *J. Sav.*, n.s. 16 (1918), 12-26, and F. M.-M. Sagnard, *La Gnose valentinienne et le témoignage de Saint Irénée* (Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, 1947), pp. 208-232.

from his own teaching should serve to control the data of the ecclesiastical adversaries. This new methodology is especially important with respect to Valentinus since the elaborate Valentinian system described by Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.*, I, 1,1 - 8,5) is three times removed from Valentinus himself. Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.*, Preaf. 2) records the version of the Valentinian system which had been taught by "the anonymous disciples of Ptolemy" (οἱ περὶ Πτολεμαῖον) who had been a direct pupil of Valentinus. Without a doubt, the transmission from Ptolemy to his disciples to Irenaeus gave many opportunities for distortion of the original teaching. Therefore, it is important to make the most of the few statements that go back a fourth step to Valentinus himself. Upon close examination it becomes apparent that these excerpts present an introduction to the theology of Valentinus with respect to cosmology, anthropology, and Christology.

(a) Cosmology. The teaching of Valentinus on cosmology is presented in Fragment 5 (*Strom.*, IV, 89,6-90).[20]

> The world (ὁ κόσμος) is as much inferior to the living Aeon (τοῦ ζῶντος αἰῶνος) as the image (ἡ εἰκών) is to the living person (τοῦ ζῶντος προσώπου). What, then, is the cause of the image? It is the greatness of the person who provides the example for the painter, so that it may be honored by his (= the person's) name. For even though the authenticity of the form is not found (in the image), the name fills up what is lacking in the work. The invisible power of God works with (the creation) so that we believe that the creation is His.

In this passage Valentinus describes the relationship between the creation and the Creator. To the extent that a "picture" (lit. image) is inferior to "the living person" which it represents, the physical world of the "Cosmos" is also inferior to the spiritual world of "the living Aeon." The basis for the picture is the greatness of the person who poses for the painter, and one can perceive the picture as an image of the person because of the name which appears underneath it. It is the same way in the Cosmos. The physical world is an image of the Creator who made it, and it gains honor and dignity because He has given His divine name to it. Therefore, Valentinus firmly believes that standing behind the visible creation is "the invisible power of God" (τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀόρατον) who brought it into existence.

---

[20] The numeration is that of A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums, Urkundlich Dargestellt* (Leipzig: Fues's Verlag, 1884), S. 293-302, and is also adopted by W. Völker, *Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1932), S. 57-59, and R. M. Grant, *Gnosticism: A Source Book of Heretical Writings for the Early Christian Period* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961), pp. 143-145. Cf. W. Förster, *Von Valentin zu Herakleon: Untersuchungen über die Quellen und die Entwicklung der valentianischen Gnosis* (Giessen: Verlag von A. Töpelmann, 1928), S. 91-96.

The interpretation of Clement of Alexandria completely misses the point when it sees in this Gnostic teaching only a discussion of the Demiurge as an image of the Father who gives it His name. Valentinus, however, is not comparing the image and the living Aeon with the Demiurge and the true God but with the physical world (= the Cosmos) and the spiritual world (= the living Aeon). In other words, the temporal world is a deficient picture of the eternal Aeon and is unconscious that it has been painted by the Creator. Therefore, the Creator overcomes this deficiency by giving His name to that which He has created, and in this way He bestows dignity and honor upon it.

The teaching of this fragment clearly reflects the Platonism of the second century A.D. which was popularized by Plotinus.[21] The Platonic dualism is seen in the contrast between the invisible world of ideas (= the living Aeon) which is the perfect "model" and the visible world of matter which is the imperfect "copy." The visible world in itself is nothing since it is the superior principle of eternal ideas which gives it reality. In this respect Valentinus is very much a product of his environment and shows that he must have learned his Greek literature well while studying in Alexandria. The way has now been prepared for the teaching of Valentinus on anthropology, for without the knowledge that the material world is an image of the divine world above, it would be impossible for man to seek after traces of the divine in the world which surrounds him or in himself.

---

[21] E. de Faye, Gnostiques, pp. 57-58, and H. Leisegang, Die Gnosis (4. Aufl.; Stuttgart; A. Kröner Verlag, 1955), S. 285. Cf. P. V. Pistorius, Plotinus and Neoplatonism (Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1952); Émile Bréhier, The Philosophy of Plotinus (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958); and Jan Zandee, The Terminology of Plotinus and of Some Gnostic Writings, Mainly the Fourth Treatise of the Jung Codex (Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut in het Nabije Oosten, 1961).

(b) Anthropology. This aspect of the teaching of Valentinus is presented in terms of the superior nature of man (Fr. 1,4 and 6) and the inferior nature of man (Fr. 1 and 2).[22] Fragment 1 (*Strom.*, II, 36,2-4) describes the creation of a pre-existent Man prior to the creation of the first man, Adam.

> Something like fear of this creature (= the pre-existent Man) fell upon the angels, for he made utterances greater than were suitable for his creation, because of the One who had invisibly put in him *(the) seed of the substance from above* (σπέρμα τῆς ἄνωθεν οὐσίας) - the One who expresses Himself freely. So also among the generations of earthly men, the works of men become terrors to those who make them, as in the case of statues and images and everything which (human) hands fashion in the name of a god. So Adam, having been fashioned in the name of a man, inspired the fear attaching to *(the) pre-existent Man* (προόντος ἀνθρώπου), as if this Man had his existence in him. The angels were terrified and rapidly marred the work.

Here Valentinus tells the story of the creation of man in mythological language. The angels - who were probably of an inferior class which included the Demiurge - made the pre-existent Man. Immediately this creature began to utter statements which transcended his intrinsic nature, and the angels became stricken with terror. This strange phenomenon took place because the superior God had invisibly deposited in man "(the) seed of the substance from above" without the angels knowing it. Coming to themselves, the angels then decided to annihilate the work of the pre-existent Man, i.e. they endeavored to remove from earthly man his superiority. This is exactly what happened on earth in the creation of the first man, Adam. He was created in the name of this "pre-existent Man" who was in him. Thus endowed with the superiority of a spiritual seed, man is able to withstand the hostile powers headed by the Demiurge which seek to destroy him. In this way Valentinus succeeds in accounting for the superior and inferior nature in every man. Whereas the former is a gift from God, the latter is a result of his creation by the angels.

---

[22] E. de Faye, *op. cit.*, p. 63. Cf. G. Quispel, "La conception de l'homme dans la gnose Valentinienne," *Eranos-Jahrbuch*, 15 (1947), 249-286.

In Fragment 2 (*Strom*., II, 114-3-6) the inferior nature of man is further described as the part of man which is possessed by evil spirits.

> The God is one, His presence is the manifestation through the Son (διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ). By him (= the Son) alone can the heart become pure, when every evil spirit is expelled from the heart. For many spirits dwelling in it do not allow it to be pure; each one of them performs its own works, insulting it in many ways with unseemly desires. To me it seems that the heart suffers rather as an inn does. An inn has holes and trenches made in it and often is filled with dung by men who stay there with licentious behaviour and take no care of the place since it belongs to someone else. Just so, the heart is unclean before it is cared for; it is the abode of many demons. But when the Father who alone is good (ὁ μόνος ἀγαθὸς πατήρ) visits it, it is sanctified and shines with light. Thus, he who has such a heart is blessed, because he will see God.

The implication is that as long as the Father had not manifested Himself to man through the Son, the heart of man remained a dwelling-place for many evil spirits, each of which accomplished his unseemly desires in him. Then he compares the man in this condition of evil with an inn (cf. Plato, *Rep*.

580a) in which each guest behaves indecently because the house is not his property. But if "the Father who alone is good" is allowed to take the heart of man into His care, it will be made holy and will be illumined with light. This concern for man causes the Father to manifest Himself through the Son, with the result that the Father works in the Son to cleanse the heart of man. The man whose heart is cleansed in this manner is "blessed, because he will see God" (cf. Matt. 5:8).

The interpretation of Clement should be called into question again because he understands this fragment only from the pessimistic point of view which sees man as the abode of demons. He accuses Valentinus of representing the evil spirits in such a way that they fatally invade the soul entirely irrespective of the will of man. This is not a just accusation, however, because it reads into Valentinus a fatalism which was common among the Stoics. Instead, the pessimistic view of man before the intervention of Christ is contrasted with the optimistic view of man with a pure heart illumined by God.

In Fragment 4 (*Strom*., IV, 89,1-3) the superior nature of man is further described as a nature which is pre-destined by God to be immortal.

> From the very beginning you are immortal and children of eternal life (τεκνα ζωῆς αιωνιας). You wished to distribute death among yourselves in order to consume it and spend it, so that death might die in you and through you. For when you destroy the world but are not destroyed yourselves, you are lords over the creation and over all decay.

Here Valentinus addresses the true Gnostics as the elect who are predestined from the very beginning to be immortal and "children of eternal life." In contrast to fallen men who are subject to the possession of demons and the power of death, the Gnostics are able to overcome death and are no longer subject to the hostile powers which seek to destroy them.

In this respect Valentinus sets forth a one-sided doctrine of pre-destination which goes back to man's creation. This is exactly how Clement interprets the passage. Nevertheless, he misunderstands the meaning of the elect destroying death as a usurping of the work of Christ and insists that the elect are only able to overcome death because Jesus has first destroyed it himself.

In Fragment 6 (*Strom.*, VI, 52-3-4) the superior nature of man is not to be found by searching the external words of Scripture but by examining the innermost depths of the heart.

> Many things written in the ordinary books are also written in the Church of God. For they are common words from the heart (ἀπὸ καρδίας), the law written in the heart (ἐν καρδίᾳ). This is the people of the Beloved (τοῦ ἠγαπημένου) (= Christ), loved by him and loving him.

In this passage Valentinus teaches that the manifestation of God in the Church takes place "in the heart," i.e. in man's search for the divine root of his existence in the Father. This kind of introspection does not result from man's external search of "the ordinary books" of Scripture (cf. John 5:39) but is based on man's inward search for his divine origin in the Father. The implication is that the Scripture itself is not authoritative for Valentinus. Instead, his authority is "the law written in the heart" (cf. Jer. 31:33). Thus, the people of "the Beloved" (= Christ) are not those who rely on the external help of "the ordinary books" of Scripture but those who discover "from the heart" that the root of their existence is in the Father.

Although the idea of pre-destination clearly dominates the teaching of Valentinus in the realm of anthropology, it is significant that the appearance of Christ is not overlooked. Therefore, it is fitting to turn to the realm of Christology.

(c) Christology. The teaching of Valentinus with respect to Christ is presented in Fragments 1, 2, and 3. Fragment 3 (*Strom.*, III, 59,3) presents a picture of Christ as a metaphysical being whose divine nature dominates his physical nature.

> While enduring everything, he was continent. Jesus exercised (*his*) *divine nature* (θεότητι). He ate and drank in a peculiar way and did not evacuate his food. For he had so great a power of continence that the food was not corrupted in him, since he himself was not perishable.

According to Valentinus, Jesus is not a human being who somehow faces the temptations of man without knowing sin but a divine being who endures everything in continence. He does not eat or drink like an ordinary man who digests his food and lets it pass from him. Instead, his power of continence is so great that his food does not digest in him. This is possible because his divine nature is incorruptible. Strangely enough, Clement quotes this interesting teaching approvingly in the course of his discussion on continence. Perhaps the reason for his approval is explained by his own inclination toward a development of Christology in the same direction as Valentinus. Clement (*Strom*. IV, 8,71) also says on one occasion that Jesus was "incapable of suffering" (ἀπαθής). If the traditional doctrine of the historical Jesus was in the process of being transformed by an entirely metaphysical Christ, Valentinus is in this development only a forerunner whose position cannot be distinguished from the ecclesiastical writer who quotes him.

Whereas Fragment 3 deals with the person of the Saviour, Fragments 1 and 2 deal with the process of salvation. In Fragment 1 "(the) seed of the substance from above" is given to man by God and is not something that was included in his creation by the angels. In Fragment 2 the heart becomes pure only through the manifestation of the Son. On the one hand, man's pre-destination goes back to the time of his creation by God. On the other hand, man's salvation awaits the manifestation of the Son. The implication is that the appearance of Christ is necessary in order to bring man to an awareness of the divine seed which the Father has implanted in him.

The statements of Valentinus pertaining to Christology clearly indicate that Jesus occupies a central place in his teaching and that he is described with a reverence and respect which rivals that of the Church Fathers. It is significant that all six passages preserved by Clement of Alexandria are dominated by an emphasis which is "Christocentric," not "Pleromatocentric" or "Sophiacentric" as in the fully developed Valentinian system.

The picture of the teaching of Valentinus which these original fragments reveal is indeed remarkable. His cosmology views the visible world as the work of "the invisible power of God." His anthropology contrasts man's inferior nature apart from Christ with man's superior nature which is aroused by the appearance of Christ. His Christology puts the emphasis on the divine nature of Christ and describes his redemptive work as communicating to man the divine origin of his existence in the Father. Therefore, the theology of Valentinus is not a series of confused speculations about a prehistoric past; it is rather a poetical expression of the redemption of man by the Saviour. Man and the Saviour are the only protagonists in this drama of salvation. An occasional recourse to mythical symbols and philosophical speculations is only an attempt to explain in images the encounter of man and Christ. The main inspiration which underlies the teaching of Valentinus, however, is undoubtedly the Christian religion. For this reason it is quite likely that his theology would have been acceptable to the average Christian of the second century.[23]

The life and teaching of Valentinus up to this point leave many questions unanswered, but they do provide a glimpse of one whom de Faye labels "the most daring speculative mind in the second century."[24] When de Faye first expounded this view of the importance of Valentinus in 1913, no one even dreamed that a whole Gnostic library would be unearthed three decades later which would contain an entire codex belonging to the Valentinian school of Gnosticism. The fact that one of the documents may be a homily written by Valentinus himself has created no small stir in the scholarly world. Therefore, it is with real anticipation and excitement that consideration will be given to the authorship of the Gospel of Truth.

III. THE PROBLEM OF AUTHORSHIP

A close examination of the Gospel of Truth reveals that nothing is said about its date or provenance, and there is also no hint of the name of the author or the place of composition. Under these circumstances the problem of authorship must be approached from the standpoint of evaluating the external evidence of the Church Fathers and from the standpoint of interpreting the internal evidence of the document itself.

---

[23] In evaluating the evidence for the life of Valentinus F. Legge (in G. Horner, *Pistis Sophia*, p. xxxix) concludes that "only Clement of Alexandria ... *quotes directly* from Valentinus' own words; and from these, it appears that Valentinus' theology differed little in outward appearance from that of the Catholic Church of his time." Perhaps this Christian orientation of the thought of Valentinus is what leads E. F. Scott, "Valentinianism" in J. Hastings's *E. R. E.*, 12 (1922), 572, to go so far as to say that it is very doubtful that Valentinus ever formally detached himself from orthodox Christianity.

[24] E. de Faye, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

(1) The External Evidence of Irenaeus. The basic presupposition upon which the external evidence is based is the view that the newly discovered Gnostic document is the same as the Evangelium Veritatis which is mentioned by Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., III, 11,9). It is important to notice that the comments of Irenaeus concerning this document occur in passing in Book III of his "Refutation," not in the course of his exposition of the Valentinian system of the disciples of Ptolemy in Book I.

> But those who are from Valentinus, being here again without any reverence, bring forth their own compositions and boast of having more Gospels than there are. In fact they have gone to such lengths of audacity as to entitle what was not long ago composed by them (the) Gospel of Truth, though it in no way agrees with the Gospels of the apostles, lest even the Gospel should be without blasphemy among them. For if what is brought forth by them is the Gospel of Truth but is unlike those which were passed on to us by the apostle, "those who will can learn" (as Scripture itself intimates) that what was passed on by the apostles is no longer the Gospel of the truth.

Although nothing is quoted from the Gospel of Truth nor are its contents discussed, at least four facts can be deduced from the comments of Irenaeus: a) the Valentinians had a writing called the "Gospel of Truth;" b) it was recent; c) it was unlike the four canonical Gospels; and d) his indignation was aroused by the implied insufficiency of the four Gospels. The information presented by Irenaeus will be discussed under the headings of origin, date, structure, and purpose.

(a) Origin. The origin of the Gospel of Truth is only given by Irenaeus in general terms as coming from the Valentinians. He says that "they (the Valentinians) have gone to such lengths of audacity to entitle what was not long ago composed by them (the) Gospel of Truth." Perhaps the use of the plural forms "they have gone to such lengths" (processerunt) and "composed by them" (ab his conscriptum) can be explained by the fact that the bishop of Lyons had no accurate data about the author of the document or else that he used the expressions in question in a general sense, preferring to mention the school as a whole rather than singling out its founder. The implication is that his statement is based merely on the boasts of the Valentinians who had been disrupting the life of the Church in the vicinity of Lyons and not upon a personal acquaintance with the document itself.

The same impression is given by a specific reference to the teaching of the Gospel of Truth which Irenaeus again ascribes to the Valentinians in general. Although he probably obtained his information from secondary sources, Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., II, 24, 6) gives evidence of his acquaintance with the Parable of the Lost Sheep as it appears in the newly discovered document.

> But further, though they (the Valentinians) call material things "left hand" and say that whatsoever is of the left hand necessarily falls into perdition and that the Saviour came to the lost sheep to transfer it to the "right hand" - that is, to those ninety-nine sheep who belong to salvation and did not perish but remained in the fold - they still have to admit that (the latter), being a gesture of the left hand, do not (by their own definition) belong to salvation (cf. Ev. Ver., p. 31,34 - 32,9).

The same method of counting occurs in the Gospel of Truth, in which the numbers up to 99 are reproduced by different positions of the fingers of the left hand, while 100 and the following hundreds are expressed with the right hand. In both passages Irenaeus is consistent in speaking only in a general way about "the Valentinians" without showing any concern about identifying the specific author of the document.[25]

---

[25] Tertullian (Praescr. Haer. 25) also refers to the Gospel of Truth in the same general way when he says that the Valentinians speak of "a secret Gospel." Pseudo-Tertullian (Adv. Omn. Haer. 4), however, is more specific when he says that "he (Valentinus) also has his own Gospel beyond (continued next page)

(b) Date. The reference to "what was not long ago composed by them" provides a clue for dating the document. When Irenaeus says that the Valentinian writing was composed "not long ago" (_non_ _olim_), he means that it was put together in the recent past. Irenaeus wrote his "Refutation of Gnosticism" about A.D. 180-188, enabling the _terminus_ _ad_ _quem_ of the Gospel of Truth to be fixed at A.D. 180. A decision concerning the _terminus_ _a_ _quo_ is more difficult. If it is calculated in round numbers that "long ago" means about a hundred years and that "very recently" means about ten years, then "not long ago" or "recently" could refer to anything that happened within a span of forty years but not less than ten years. This would allow for Valentinus to have written the document during the peak of his career in the time of Bishop Pius (A.D. 140-155), perhaps fixing the _terminus_ _a_ _quo_ at A.D. 140. Having narrowed the limits in this way to about A.D. 140-170, it is entirely possible that Valentinus himself wrote it while he was in Rome and while he was still in or not far out of the Church.

(c) Structure. Irenaeus specifically says that "it in no way agrees with the Gospels of the apostles." The use of "in no way" (_nihilo_) refers more to structure than to ideas. Irenaeus objects so strongly to the Gospel of Truth because it does not contain the familiar Gospel pattern which he considers essential for the Gospel. From the literary point of view the four canonical Gospels all agree in structuring the life of Christ within the framework of concrete historical events which proceed from his baptism by John to his crucifixion and resurrection. No such pattern can be found in the Gospel of Truth. The crucifixion is

---

(footnote 25 continued) these of ours." If this unknown author is speaking of the same treatise, it is interesting to note that he refers to the author in the singular as Valentinus himself.

announced near the beginning of the homily, and the only protagonists in the drama of salvation are "Jesus Christ" (who is also called "Jesus" and "Christ") and man. There are no sayings of Jesus, and there is no mention of any apostle or disciple. Therefore, it must be admitted that the main concrete fact that Irenaeus sets forth concerning the structure of the Gospel of Truth is in full agreement with the newly discovered document. Therefore, Irenaeus's objection to the Gnostic writing is largely motivated by the fact that he is not willing to accept any writing as a "Gospel" which does not follow the pattern of the four canonical Gospels.

(d) Purpose. Irenaeus also objects to the fact that the Valentinians "boast of having more Gospels than there are," i.e. a fifth Gospel in addition to the four canonical ones. His purpose in mentioning the Gospel of Truth is not to expose the details of its content of which he does not seem to be aware but to deny the possibility of having any more or less than four Gospels. The existence of a fifth Gospel automatically implies that the four canonical Gospels are not sufficient. Therefore, the very thought of a fifth Gospel seriously weakens his arguments for the existence of four which immediately precedes his discussion of the Gospel of Truth. Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., III, 11, 8) uses every possible means to defend the necessity of having only four Gospels.

> It is not possible that the Gospels can be either more or fewer in number than they are. For since there are four zones of the world in which we live, and four principle winds, while the Church is scattered throughout all the world, and the pillar and ground of the Church is the Gospel and the spirit of life, it is fitting that it should have four pillars, breathing out immortality on every side, and vivifying men afresh. ... For the cherubim, too, were four-faced, and their faces were images of the dispensation of the Son of God. ... For the living creatures are quadriform, and the Gospel is quadriform.

The argument of Irenaeus may seem somewhat exaggerated to the modern reader, but it is essentially a reaction against the view of Marcion who accepted *only* the Gospel of Luke and of Valentinus who accepted *also* the Gospel of Truth. Irenaeus is obviously using the term "Gospel" in the later sense of a written document with a definite literary pattern. This pattern had become so fixed in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John that its perfect expression could only be found in these "four." Whereas Irenaeus is quick to point out that the Gospel of Truth is not a fifth Gospel from the literary point of view, he leaves many questions unanswered concerning what the document itself actually is. An examination of this newly discovered Gnostic writing reveals that it does not use the term εὐαγγέλιον in the later sense of "a literary document" but in the original sense of "saving message." Therefore, the external evidence of Irenaeus needs to be supplemented by a consideration of the internal evidence of the document itself.

(2) The Internal Evidence of the Homily. The discussion of the internal evidence hinges upon the relationship of the document to what is known about the life and teaching of Valentinus. From this inner perspective it will be necessary to discuss the author, the style, the contents, and the title of the Gospel of Truth.

(a) Author. In contrast to Irenaeus who ascribes the Gnostic writing in general to "the Valentinians," the document itself allows for the possibility of only one author. Only once does the author make an appearance, and then it is just long enough to make it clear that he has quite consciously kept himself in the background. Just before the end of the homily, the author gives a proleptic description of the blessed existence of the true Gnostic in the "Resting-Place" of the Father.

p. 42,39 May the remainder (= the potential Gnostics),
therefore,
know in their place (τόπος) (= wherever they
are) that
it is not fitting for *me*,
p. 43,1 after *I* have settled in the Resting-Place,
to say anything else (lit. another thing),
but (ἀλλά)
I will remain in it (= the Resting-Place)
(continually) and
will occupy myself always with the Father of
5 the All....

He does not consider it appropriate to discuss his own experience, as was the custom in most of the Mystery Religions.[26] He also refrains from commenting any further on the message of salvation in Christ since enough has already been said to point the way to the eternal "Resting-Place" of the true Gnostic in the Father. This use of the first person pronoun at the end of the document immediately calls to mind the closing words of the Gospel of John which contain a similar reference in the first person to the Johannine author.

> But there are also many other things which Jesus did; if every one of them were to be written, *I* suppose that the world itself could not contain the books that would be written (John 21:25).

It is significant that both the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth are anonymous writings and nowhere mention their author by name. Instead of referring to himself by name, the author of the Fourth Gospel hides under the cloak of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (John 13:23; 19:26; 20:2; 21:7 and 20). Nevertheless, both documents clearly minimize the personal experience of their author and magnify the salvation which the Father makes available to man through the Son.

(b) Style. The style in which the author presents the saving message of salvation is also quite consistent and uniform throughout, again indicating the work of one author. Its haunting, poetic quality is illustrated by an unusual progression of ten sentences, each of which contains four words in the Coptic text - except in the sentence containing the periphrastic verb "being like a crown" (ⲈϤⲞⲈⲒ Ⲛ̄ⲚⲞⲨⲔⲖⲀⲘ) (p. 23,23-24). Various attributes of the Father are listed in a natural sequence from wisdom to faith (= faithfulness), and each of them receives its definitive expression in the appearance of the *Logos*.

---

[26] Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*, XI, 22. Cf. K. E. Kirk, *The Vision of God: The Christian Doctrine of the Summum Bonum* (2nd Edition; London: Longmans, 1941), pp. 30-32.

p. 23,18 His wisdom (σοφία) / meditates (μελετᾶν)
on / the Word;
His teaching gives him / expression;
His knowledge / is made manifest; /
His forebearance (?) is like / a crown upon him;
His / joy is mingled / in him;
His glory / is exalted in him;
His image (?) / he has revealed; /
His rest he has enclosed within him;
His love (ἀγάπη) / is embodied (- σῶμα) in him;
His / faith has encompassed / him.

Having described the way in which the attributes of the Father are individually manifested in the appearance of Christ, the author then concludes this poetical section with a summary statement which explains the meaning of the entire passage: "The Word (= *Logos*) thus goes forth from the Father into the world (lit. the All) as the fruit of His heart and expression (?) of His will" (p. 23,33 - p. 24,2).

Of special interest is the use of the Graeco-Latin hybrid *forma* in a passage which describes man's self-awareness of the divine origin of his existence as the reception of a "form" and a "name" from the Father.

p. 27,15 They did (not) know Him (= the Father)
because they had not yet
received a form (ⲘⲞⲢⲪⲎ = μορφή) nor (οὔτε)
had they yet
received a name, every one of which (= form
and name)
the Father produces.
Then (τότε) they received form (ⲪⲞⲢⲘⲎ = μορφή)
21 and knowledge from Him.

The Coptic word ⲫⲟⲣⲙⲏ (p. 27,20) represents a confusion of the Latin *forma* with the Greek μορφή, perhaps indicating that the author wrote in the Latin-speaking half of the Roman Empire. Moreover, the Coptic version is apparently the translation of a Greek original,[27] thus pointing to a place in the Latin-speaking world where Christians still spoke Greek. This would suggest Rome, Southern Italy, or the Rhone Valley. The Bishop of Lyons, however, is silent concerning the activity of a brilliant Valentinian in his own neighborhood when he indignantly speaks of Gnostic morals there (*Adv. Haer.*, I, 13, 7), suggesting that Rome is perhaps the more likely place of composition.[28] The two outstanding followers of Valentinus in Rome were Ptolemy and Heracleon, yet the surviving fragments of their writings do not favor their authorship of this work. The document itself demands for its author a highly cultured person, long familiar with the philosophy of Plato, obsessed by the deepest religious aspirations of his time, and haunted by the message of salvation. From the standpoint of the sensitivity of language, the elevation of thought, and the poetic quality of the style, the writing points to a leading figure of the second century, probably to Valentinus himself.

---

[27] Sixty-eight Greek words appear in this document a total of 242 times. The frequent use of Greek words (especially particles) in the Coptic language reflects the influence of Christianity which comes about as a result of the translation of the Bible into the native Coptic dialects. However, the frequency with which Greek words are used varies from one dialect to another and cannot be used as proof that the Gospel of Truth was originally written in Greek. For example, Herbert Thompson, *The Gospel of St. John*, p. xx, lists nine examples of native words in that Subakhmimic manuscript where the Sahidic version has Greek words and only two examples for the converse. Cf. A. Böhlig, *Die griechischen Lehnwörter im sahidischen und bohairischen Neuen Testament* (München: R. Lerche, 1954).

[28] W. C. van Unnik, "The Recently Discovered 'Gospel of Truth' and the New Testament" in F. L. Cross, *op. cit.*, pp. 96-97, originally used the system of counting in the Parable of the Lost Sheep (*Ev. Ver.*, p. 31,34 - p. 32,9) as evidence for the origin of the Gospel of Truth in the western half of the Roman Empire, probably in Rome itself. He has since retracted this view (W. C. van Unnik, *Gnostic Writings*, p. 64, note 1) as a result of the work of H. I. Marrou, "L'Évangile de Vérité et la diffusion du compte digital dans l'antiquité," *Vig. Chr.*, 12 (1958), 98-103, which shows that this system of counting was widely used throughout the ancient world.

(c) Contents. The strongest argument for the Valentinian authorship of the Gospel of Truth is the resemblance of its vocabulary and thought to what is known about Valentinian Gnosis. It will be helpful to present the similarities and differences of the homily in relation to Valentinianism and then to evaluate the three ways in which this information has been interpreted by the leading Gnostic specialists of our time.

On the one hand, the language and thought of the Gospel of Truth clearly contains some of the main characteristics of Valentinian Gnosis. The Pleroma (πλήρωμα)[29] is understood as the divine realm which is inhabited by the eternal God and all His emanations. The transcendent entities in the Pleroma are also called "Aeons" (αἰών).[30] The totality of the universe, including human creatures, is referred to as "the All" (ⲠⲦⲎⲢϤ)[31] and is set over against "the deficiency" (ⲠϢⲦⲀ)[32] or the "lack" of the world below which is incomplete (= ὑστέρημα). The Pleroma is further characterized as the "Place" (τόπος)[33] in the absolute sense as the region which is inhabited by the supreme God and in the eschatological sense as "the Resting-Place" (ⲠⲘⲀ Ⲛ̄ⲘⲦⲀⲚ)[34] which awaits all those who ascend on high into the Pleroma (= ἀνάπαυσις). The frequent use in the Gospel of Truth of such terms as πλήρωμα, ὑστέρημα, and ἀνάπαυσις at least indicates that the work originated in Valentinian circles.

---

[29] Ev. Ver., p. 16,35; p. 35,8, 9, and 35-36; p. 36,10; p. 41,1 and 14; p. 43,15-16; cf. p. 34,30 and 36; p. 41,15-16. Cf. footnote 92.

[30] Ev. Ver., p. 19,1; p. 24,17; p. 27,7; p. 38,35-36; cf. p. 23,1 and 16. The plural is expressed by the Coptic article ⲚⲒ . Cf. footnote 113.

[31] Ev. Ver., p. 17,5 and 6-7; p. 18,34, 35, and 38; p. 19,8, 9, and 15; p. 20,2, 18, and 19; p. 21,9, 10, 19, and 20; p. 23,35; p. 24,3 and 5; p. 43,5. Cf. footnote 108.

[32] Ev. Ver., p. 24,21, 26, 29, and 32; p. 25,2; p. 35,12, 28, and 36; p. 43,8; cf. p. 35,9.

[33] Ev. Ver., p. 25,29; p. 33,19-20; p. 40,32; p. 42,37, 38-39, and 40; cf. p. 23,3 for τύπος instead of τόπος as a result of a scribal error (continued next page)

On the other hand, the differences between the Gospel of Truth and Valentinian Gnosis must also be admitted. There is a conspicuous absence from the treatise of the typical elements of Valentinianism in its classical elaboration. There is no mention of the thirtyfold complex of Aeons, of the intervention of the Demiurge, and of the adventures of Sophia-Achamoth. Instead, the author of the Gospel of Truth chooses to emphasize the message of salvation which is communicated from the Father to man in silent Grace by means of the Logos as an expression of His Thought and Mind.[35] There is only a vague resemblance to the first three pairs of the Ogdoad in the classical Valentinian system, i.e. Father and Thought (= Grace, Silence), Mind and Truth, Logos and Life. Rather than describe the metaphysical pre-cosmic evolution of divinity itself in the descending array of thirty Aeons, the Gospel of Truth points out the nature of the Father as "illimitable, inconceivable, and incorruptible" and maintains that "grace to know Him" (elsewhere expressed as "the knowledge of the Father") is offered to those who perceive His Call.[36] The actual content

---

(footnote 33 continued) in copying. In the fully developed Valentinian system of the disciples of Ptolemy τόπος refers to the middle region which is inhabited by the inferior creator called the Demiurge. Cf. M. Malinine, op. cit., p. xiii.

[34] Ev. Ver., p. 36,39; p. 40,32; p. 41,13; p. 43,1.

[35] Ev. Ver., p. 16,33-36; p. 37,7-12.

[36] Ev. Ver., p. 17,7; p. 35,14; p. 16,32-33; p. 30,4-5; and p. 22,4-10.

of the document is described by W. C. van Unnik as

> a sermon, a devotional contemplation, or, if you will, a dogmatic or mystical tractate, in which we are told how the not-knowing of the Father of All, whereby error came into being, was abolished by the appearance of Jesus on the scene so that we now know the Father and learn to rest in Him.[37]

The peculiarly heretical traits of Valentinian Gnosis, such as the distinction between the unknown God and the lower Demiurge or the enumeration of Aeons, are not emphasized in the Gospel of Truth. On the contrary, the author is primarily interested in Christ who is the revelation of the Truth and in the salvation which he brings. He understands Gnosis as the existential encounter with Christ by which man becomes conscious of the true origin of his existence in the Father.

The bearing of these similarities and differences upon the relationship between the Gospel of Truth and Valentinian Gnosis has been subjected to three main interpretations by the leading scholars working in the field of Gnosticism. The first view, by emphasizing the similarities and attempting to explain the differences, sees the Gospel of Truth as an early work of Valentinus whose teaching is later expanded and systematized by his followers. The second view, by attempting to reconcile the differences with the similarities, sees the document as a late work of Valentinus which summarizes the meaning of his earlier mythological teaching. The third view, by emphasizing the differences, concludes that the Gospel of Truth is not a work of the Valentinian school of Gnosticism. The first is associated primarily with W. C. van Unnik; the second with Hans Jonas; and the third with H.-M. Schenke. Each of these interpretations will be presented and evaluated in an effort to determine which one is most compatible with the available evidence concerning the life and teaching of Valentinus.

---

[37] W. C. van Unnik in F. L. Cross, op. cit., p. 95.

Early Valentinus. The first scholar unequivocally to advocate the Valentinian authorship of the Gospel of Truth was W. C. van Unnik.[38] Affirming that this document is identical with the one mentioned by Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.*, III, 11, 9), he reasons that its content is not discussed by Irenaeus because it is so close to orthodox Christianity. Although its content is Gnostic, its Gnosticism is not emphasized. The treatise stands in sharp contrast to the typical elements of Valentinian Gnosis in its classical elaboration and points to a stage in Valentinian doctrine which is prior to its expanded development in the writings of Ptolemy and Heracleon. Therefore, he concludes that the Gospel of Truth was written by Valentinus at Rome about A.D. 140-145 before the development of his typically Gnostic dogma. This was either shortly before or shortly after the time of his break with the Church.

Also sympathetic with this view are G. Quispel and H.-C. Puech, the main editors of the *editio princeps* of the Gospel of Truth. Exercizing more caution, they prefer to date the composition about A.D. 150 and consider it to be either the work of Valentinus himself or one of his early disciples. This conclusion is again based on the Christian coloration of the document and the early presentation of Gnosis without the later mythological elaboration. As the editors express it, "thus would be explained ... it very hazy heterodoxy, the absence, the scarcity, or the vagueness, in the doctrine which it presents of the elements which are characteristic of the Valentinian system."[39]

---

[38] W. C. van Unnik, "Het kortgeleden outdekte 'Evangelie der Wahrheid' en het Nieuwe Testament," *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks*, Deel 17, No. 3 (Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maaschappij, 1954), translated into English as "The 'Gospel of Truth' and the New Testament" in F. L. Cross, *op. cit.*, esp. pp. 99-104. Cf. W. C. van Unnik, *Gnostic Writings*, pp. 61-63.

Further support for this view can be found from K. Grobel. Upon considering the difficulty of deciding between Valentinus or one of his early disciples, Grobel prefers the more daring position of van Unnik. If the Gospel of Truth was written by a pupil of Valentinus, Grobel is convinced that it must be an "earlier" one than Ptolemy or Heracleon because the author is less evolved in the irresistible mythological-heterodox trend than either of them. Therefore, he concludes:

> We are left with the choice of a brilliant, unrecorded pupil of Valentinus early enough to have written at Rome this not even certainly heretical work - or Valentinus himself. Economy of theory favors the latter....[40]

By refusing to translate two obscure Coptic words with definite Gnostic connotations - ϯⲏ (= emanation) and ⲙⲁⲉⲓⲧ (= space) - he emphasizes the orthodoxy of the Gospel of Truth and sees the remaining development of Valentinian Gnosis as a tendency toward more and more daring speculation and vivid mythology.

R. M. Grant who also holds to the Valentinian authorship of the Gospel of Truth gives added emphasis to the question of development.[41]

---

[39] M. Malinine, *op. cit.*, p. xiv. Cf. H. C. Puech in F. L. Cross, *op. cit.*, p. 18, and G. Quispel in F. L. Cross, *op. cit.*, p. 50. These two articles first appeared together in Dutch under the title *Op Zoek naar het Evangelie der Wahrheid* (Nijmegen: G. F. Callenbach, N. V., 1954). Puech approached the Gospel of Truth in the light of his extensive interest in Manichaeism - H. C. Puech, *Le Manichéisme: son fondateur, sa doctrine* (Paris: Civilisations du Sud, S. A. E. P., 1949). Quispel approached the Gospel of Truth in the light of his general interest in Gnosticism and his specific study of the roots of Gnosticism in Jewish heterodoxy - G. Quispel, *Gnosis als Weltreligion* (Zürich: Origo Verlag, 1951), "Der gnostische Anthropos und die jüdische Tradition," *Eranos-Jahrbuch*, 22 (1953), 195-234, and "Christliche Gnosis und jüdische Heterodoxie," *Ev. T.*, 14 (1954), 474-484.

[40] K. Grobel, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

[41] R. M. Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), pp. 128-142 (hereafter abbreviated R. M. Grant, *Early Christianity*).

He discerns the inclination of Valentinus toward Christian orthodoxy but acknowledges that Valentinus's philosophical interpretation of Christianity was soon "mythologized" by his disciple Ptolemy. That which had begun simply with revelation soon reached the stage of systematic theology which developed in the direction of hostility toward the Creator.

Those who regard the Gospel of Truth as a document of the early Valentinus generally agree in interpreting it as an early philosophical stage of Valentinian thought which was later expanded by his followers in a mythological direction. They see the Gospel of Truth as the germinal form of the system which was later elaborated into the full myth. The number of reputable scholars who advocate this position is indeed overwhelming.[42] Although this view admittedly remains a hypothesis, it seems to be in harmony with what is known about the life and teaching of Valentinus.

---

[42] In addition to van Unnik, Puech, Quispel, Grobel, and Grant, this view is also provisionally accepted by R. McL. Wilson, "Review Article of F. L. Cross, The Jung Codex," N. T. S., 1 (1955), 309-313; The Gnostic Problem: A Study of the Relation between Hellenistic Judaism and the Gnostic Heresy (London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., 1958), pp. 155-171; and "The Gnostic Library from Nag Hammadi," Scot. J. T., 12 (1959), 161-170; Luke Willems, "Review Article of F. M. Cross, The Jung Codex," East. Ch. Q., 11 (1955), 94-100; S. Giversen, Sandhedens evangelium: De gnostiscke håndschrifter fra Nildalen (København; G. E. C. Gads Forlag, 1957), and "Evangelium Veritatis and the Epistle to the Hebrews," St. T., 13 (1959), 87-96; Floyd V. Filson, "The Gnostic 'Gospel of Truth'," B. A., 20 (1957), 76-78, and "New Greek and Coptic Gospel Manuscripts," B. A., 24 (1961), 1-18; A. D. Nock, "A Coptic Library of Gnostic Writings," J. T. S., 9 (1958), 314-324; Otto A. Piper, "Review Article of F. L. Cross, The Jung Codex," T. Tod., 15 (1958), 131-135; C. K. Barrett, "The Gospel of Truth: The Editio Princeps of an Ancient Gnostic Text," Exp. T ., 69 (1958), 167-170; H. Ringgren, "Evangelium Veritatis och den valentinianska gnosis," Rel. Bib., 17(1958), 41-53; T. Säve-Söderbergh, Evangelium Veritatis och Thomas-evangeliet (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1959); Lucien Cerfaux, "De Saint Paul à L'Evangile de la Vérité," N. T. S., 5 (1959), 103-112; J. Doresse, Secret Books (1960), pp. 238-241; F. W. Beare, "New Light on the Church of the Second Century: Gnosticism and the Papyri of Nag Hammadi: A Review Article," Can. J. T., 6 (1960), 211-216; and W. R. Schoedel, "New Gnostic Papyri," Rel. L., 31 (1961-62), 99-107.

Late Valentinus. Hans Jonas has spent most of his lifetime in the study of Gnosticism and has been widely influential in molding the contemporary attitude toward the subject, especially on the Continent. He understands *Gnosis* as an attitude toward human existence which is synonymous with the "mentality of late antiquity" (*spätantiker Geist*).[43] This includes not only Christian Gnosticism but also the Hermetica, Neopythagoreanism, Neoplatonism, Philo, Origen, Mandaeism, Manichaeism, and the Mystery Religions. He also attempts to reconstruct a development through this maze of literature "from mythology to mystical philosophy." Therefore, it is not surprising that Jonas places the Gospel of Truth in the stream of this same development.

Starting with the existing framework of Valentinian mythology which is preserved by the Church Fathers, Jonas sees the Gospel of Truth as a later philosophical summary by Valentinus himself of the meaning of the myth. The nature of salvation is thus expressed in such abstract terms that the concrete figures of the Demiurge and Sophia can be passed over without any real loss. In other words, the Gospel of Truth is viewed as the distilled essence of the entire Valentinian system, stripped of its vast mythological accessories and reduced to its philosophical core.

In attempting to justify his distinctive position, Jonas points, first of all, to the esoteric character of the writing itself. It is written in a kind of code language which eludes the grasp of anyone who is not familiar with the entire system. For example, such words as "Forgetfulness,"

---

[43] Hans Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, 1. Band, *Die mythologische Gnosis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1934; 2. durchgesehene Aufl., 1954); 2. Band, *Von der Mythologie zur mystischen Philosophie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1954), rewritten in English without the preponderance of technicalities and with the addition of some new material as *The Gnostic Religion: The Message of the Alien God and the Beginnings of Christianity* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1958) (hereafter abbreviated H. Jonas, *Gnostic Religion*).

"Error," "Ignorance," "Anguish," and "Terror" are almost meaningless to an uninitiated reader. Therefore, Valentinus can only be so elusive, mysterious and eliptic because he presupposes the doctrinal elaboration of his earlier teachings.

Secondly, he admits that the earlier form of a theory is usually the more simple one, but he insists that this earlier form must be intelligible by itself. Since this is not the case with the Gospel of Truth, it must be a later form of the teaching of Valentinus.

Thirdly, he maintains that it is more plausible for an extract or concentrate to come after than before the full substance. Shorthand presupposes longhand, and the style of the Gospel of Truth is definitely in the realm of shorthand.

Fourthly, he presupposes the prior and contemporary existence of a Sophia speculation in the general Gnostic milieu of Valentinus. If the mythologies of Sophia and the Demiurge had not been current beforehand, it is hardly conceivable that Valentinus or one of his disciples would have devised them as a kind of after-thought in order to cloth abstract theory with enticing images and figures. Instead, Valentinus and his school evolved their doctrine by varying an existing myth and giving new twists to the meaning of older figures. The same tendency can be found in the Gospel of Truth.[44]

Instead of the early philosophical teaching being "mythologized" by the followers of Valentinus, Jonas thinks that the early mythological teaching has been "de-mythologized" by Valentinus. The weakness of this argument lies in the realm of philology. Since his main orientation is philosophical, Jonas is prone to generalize his impressions without giving specific examples to back them up. For example, are Sophia and the Demiurge to be "de-mythologized" as "Error," "Forgetfulness," "Ignorance," "Anguish," or "Terror?" Although the vocabulary of the Gospel of Truth is undoubtedly obscure at points, the presupposition of a development from the earlier concrete figures of the Valentinian system to the later abstract terms of the Gospel of Truth only adds to the obscurity. Jonas also fails to adequately show the influence of Christian thought upon the language of Valentinus. Much of the terminology of the Gospel of Truth reflects the influence of Christianity. For example, the Deity in the Gospel of Truth consists of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit without any hint of a thirty-fold complex of Aeons. God, not some Demiurge, is the Creator and is always called Father. There is only one Son, not a whole generation of Aeons. Truth is revealed by receiving the Holy Spirit, not by learning the secrets of the Pleroma.

---

[44] H. Jonas, "Besprechung von M. Malinine, Evangelium Veritatis," Gnom., 32 (1960), 327-335, insbes. 333. Cf. H. Jonas, Gnostic Religion, pp. 174-205, for an exposition of the Valentinian system which is permeated with the poetic coloration of passages from the Gospel of Truth.

Rather than acknowledge a development from philosophy to mythology, Jonas treats the mythical as primary and the philosophical as secondary. The weakness of this argument lies in the realm of chronology. His reconstruction of the teaching of Valentinus is not the picture that is presented by the Patristic sources. The earliest fragments of Valentinus preserved by Clement of Alexandria agree in emphasizing the Christocentric nature of his teaching. The Valentinus who was considered as a candidate for the Bishop of Rome surely did not begin his teaching career by expounding on the theories of the creation of the world by the Demiurge and of the origin of matter in the fall of Sophia. The mythological system which Jonas considers as primary has been ascribed to the disciples of Ptolemy by Irenaeus and is three times removed from Valentinus himself. Therefore, the view of Jonas completely reverses the chronology of the Patristic accounts and cannot be reconciled with what is known about the life of Valentinus. The implication is that Jonas has assimilated the teaching of the Gospel of Truth into his preconceived interpretation of the Valentinian system only as an after-thought, without giving much consideration to the influence of Christianity upon the thought of Valentinus.

The tendency of Jonas to consider the Gospel of Truth as a late work of Valentinus is also echoed independently by Ernst Haenchen. He does not consider the Gospel of Truth to be an immature early work but one which is permeated by a quite definite personal piety and which has thought through a very exact presentation of salvation. He admits, however, that the path from it to the Valentinian teaching recorded by Irenaeus is a "transition to another generation" (μετάβασις είς ἄλλο γένος).[45] Like Jonas, he is more concerned about the living center of the teaching of the Gospel of Truth and the fully developed Valentinian system than the question of authorship. Taken as a whole, the arguments of Jonas and Haenchen underscore the maturity of the thought of the Gospel of Truth, making it more likely that the work was written after Valentinus' break with the Church than before. The date A.D. 150 seems to fit the situation quite well, whereas the date A.D. 140-145 may be too early.

Non-Valentinian. At a time when the Valentinian authorship of the Gospel of Truth was very much in vogue, a few scholars dared to be different. The absence of the central Valentinian teachings of the Aeons, Sophia, and the Demiurge in the Gospel of Truth caused J. Leipoldt and H.-M. Schenke to look elsewhere for the explanation of its contents.

---

[45] E. Haenchen, "Besprechung von F. L. Cross, The Jung Codex," Z. Kg., 67 (1955), 151-155, insbes. 154.

Johannes Leipoldt was the first to express strong doubts concerning the Valentinian character of the document. After describing its content in detail, he concludes: "Here the Gnosis is extensively de-mythologized."[46] Instead of a highly developed system of mythology, he points out that the emphasis has been shifted to a Christocentric theology of the suffering and death of Christ for many (p. 18,22-26; p. 20,10-14). He considers the author to be a "perfect one" (p. 18,11-15) who is speaking to those who are not yet perfect. Having committed himself to some kind of esoteric behavior, the author decides that this may not have been an effective method for winning and holding converts. Therefore, he wrote the Gospel of Truth as a "missionary tract" to win converts. Leipoldt detects this missionary attitude when the writer says, "He (= Jesus) brought many back from Error" (p. 22,20-21). The impression given by this passage is that the Gospel is a work of Gnostic piety which has much in common with the teaching of the orthodox Church. Although maintaining that it is not Valentinian, Leipoldt refrains from identifying it with any other Gnostic group. This task was bequeathed to H.-M. Schenke.

From the literary point of view Hans-Martin Schenke agrees with Leipoldt in calling the Gospel of Truth a "homily." He begins by denying the identity of the newly discovered document with the Evangelium Veritatis mentioned by Irenaeus. Then he attempts to prove that this homily from the Jung Codex contains nothing which is specifically Valentinian and that its teaching is irreconcilable with Valentinianism. Having swept aside all the obstacles, he is left free to investigate the relationship between the Gospel of Truth and the Odes of Solomon. Schenke considers the Odes of Solomon to be the only Gnostic text in which the central thought of the Gospel of Truth is reproduced, i.e. the world is nothing (*Ev. Ver.*, p. 17,18-24; and *Od. Sol.*, 34,4f.; 31,1f.; 18,1f.; 38,6-14); saving knowledge is essentially knowledge of one God (*Ev. Ver.*, 24,11-18; and *Od. Sol.*, 7,12); and the Christology is non-docetic (*Ev. Ver.*, p. 18,24; and *Od. Sol.*, 27,3; 42,1f.).[47] Besides these most obvious examples, a number of other points can be found on which they agree. According to Schenke, there is only one logical conclusion - that the Gospel of Truth stems from the same Gnostic group to which the Odes of Solomon belong.

---

[46] J. Leipoldt, "Das Evangelium der Wahrheit" (Besprechung von F. L. Cross, The Jung Codex), T. L. Z., 82 (1957), 825-834, insbes. 831.

The same evidence, however, can also be used to prove that the Odes of Solomon stem from the same Gnostic group to which the Gospel of Truth belongs, i.e. the Valentinian school. The Valentinian origin of the Odes of Solomon which was originally suggested by Erwin Preuschen[48] now seems to be confirmed by the Gospel of Truth. This view has found a more recent advocate in R. M. Grant. A careful comparison of the thought of Odes 23 and 38 with the Gospel of Truth leads him to the conclusion that the Odes of Solomon come from the school of Valentinus, perhaps from Valentinus himself, and that they were presumably written about A.D. 140-150.[49] This date at least indicates that the Odes of Solomon and the Gospel of Truth could have been written at about the same time and perhaps in the same Valentinian milieu. It is also striking that both documents share a common interest in the Fourth Gospel, the favorite Gospel of the Valentinians.

---

[47] H.-M. Schenke, "Die fehlenden Seiten des sogenannten Evangeliums der Wahrheit," *T. L. Z.*, 83 (1958), S. 497, n.1, and *Die Herkunft des sogenannten Evangelium Veritatis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959), S. 26-29 (hereafter abbreviated H.-M. Schenke, *Herkunft*). A similar position is taken by E. Segelberg, *Masbūtā: Studies in the Ritual of Mandaean Baptism* (Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells, 1958), p. 168, and "Evangelium Veritatis - a Confirmation Homily and its Relation to the Odes of Solomon," *Or. Suec.*, 4 (1959), 3-42, who views the Gospel of Truth as a Gnostic "baptismal homily" for the instruction of initiates. The writer is indebted to H.-M. Schenke for the reference to the Gospel of Truth in the former work of Segelberg.

[48] E. Preuschen in H. Gunkel, "Die Oden Salomos," *Z. N. T. W.*, 11 (1910), S. 328, Anm. 3, says: "Just as the author of the present article is thoroughly convinced about the Gnostic origin of these Odes, I hope to be able to show in the near future just as much evidence for the fact that a portion of the Psalms of Valentinus has been recovered in these Hymns." Cf. W. R. Newbold, "Bardaisan and the Odes of Solomon," *J. B. L.*, 30 (1911), 161-204, and W. Stölten, "Gnostische Parallelen zu den Oden Salomos," *Z. N. T. W.*, 13 (1912), 29-58.

Although Leipoldt and Schenke have rightly revealed the literary character of the document as a homily on the theme of salvation, they have not succeeded in proving the non-Valentinian character of the work. The many similarities with the Odes of Solomon can be acknowledged without abandoning the Valentinian authorship of the Gospel of Truth.

These three interpretations of the content of the Gospel of Truth have been dealt with in considerable detail because it is here that the question of Valentinian authorship either stands or falls. By accepting the first view as the one which is most compatible with the available evidence, it seems highly probable that Valentinus is the author of the Gospel of Truth. The final aspect of the problem of authorship which deserves consideration is the meaning of the title. The importance of this matter has already been indicated in the discussion of the external evidence for the structure and purpose of the Gospel of Truth as presented by Irenaeus.

(d) Title. Strictly speaking, the homily does not have a title since what has come to be used as the title is simply its opening words. Its content is also of such a nature that it would not be confused with a "Gospel" in the sense of a literary account of the ministry and teaching of Jesus. The title "the Gospel of Truth" must have been adopted as a matter of convenience and is reminiscent of the Semitic custom of naming books by their opening words, e.g. "In the beginning" (בְּרֵאשִׁית) (Gen. 1:1). In the case of this Gnostic homily the opening words ⲠⲈⲨⲀⲄⲄⲈⲖⲒⲞⲚ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲘⲎⲈ also state the theme of the entire work. Whereas the term εὐαγγέλιον will be discussed later in connection with the way of salvation, it is important at this point to consider the main problem of syntax in these opening words, i.e. the meaning of the genitive case in the expression "of (the) truth" (τῆς ἀληθείας). G. Quispel[50] interprets it as a qualitative genitive, i.e. as a substitute for an adjective, by which he understands the opening phrase as "the true Gospel" in distinction from and in opposition to the four canonical Gospels. Yet one looks in vain in the homily for any expression of polemics or rivalry on the part of the author. In fact, the Gnostic writer constantly uses the canonical Gospels as a major source and seems to know most of the books of the New Testament.[51] Instead of being a "Fifth Gospel," this document is a presentation of "the glad tidings of the truth" concerning the redemption of man by Christ. The phrase Ⲛ̄ⲦⲘⲎⲈ is more likely used as an appositive genitive, i.e. the genitive used in the sense of apposition, meaning "the good news which is the truth." The implication is that the homily is not intended to be a Gospel in the literary sense but that it deals only with the truth which *is* the gospel, i.e. with the distilled essence which is the real meaning of the gospel. This truth is the revelation of the "good news" which is the message of salvation which the appearance of Christ makes known to man.[52]

---

[49] R. M. Grant, Early Christianity, pp. 132-134. Cf. S. Schulz, "Die Bedeutung der Gnosisfunde für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft," T. Ru., 26 (1960), 237-266, insbes. 261.

---

[50] G. Quispel in F. L. Cross, op. cit., p. 48. Nevertheless, his suggestion is valid in showing how easily it would have been for Irenaeus to understand the title this way and to assume that this document was setting itself up as a new Gospel in addition to the four canonical ones. W.C. van Unnik in F. L. Cross, op. cit., p. 106, suggests that "the misunderstanding of Irenaeus arose from the fact that he already possessed another sense of the word 'Gospel' when it was used in connection with a writing." Cf. G. Friedrich, εὐαγγέλιον, in G. Kittel's T. W. N. T., 2 (1935), 723-734, for the significance of the word in the New Testament and especially pp. 733-734 for the transition to the second century.

[51] A collation of the New Testament references in the critical notes of M. Malinine, op. cit., pp. 51-60, the citations of W. C. van Unnik in F. L. Cross, op. cit., pp. 115-121, and the footnotes of H.-M. Schenke, Herkunft, S. 33-37, reveals that the author refers most frequently to Matthew or Luke, John, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Colosians, Philippians, Hebrews, and Revelation. Cf. J. D. McCaughley, "The Gnostic Gospel of Truth and the New Testament," Aust. B. R., 6 (1958), 87-108, B. Gärtner, "Evangelium (continued next page)

The explanation of the meaning of the title as "the truth concerning the good news" conveys for the most part the original intention of the author in writing the homily. Upon examining the document firsthand, there is no reason to confuse it with a Gospel in the sense of a literary document. Irenaeus apparently did not have the privilege of seeing the document for himself and mistook it for another written Gospel in opposition to the canonical ones. His one concrete fact about the Gnostic document (*in nihilo conveniens apostolorum evangeliis*) is even more correct than he realized since the author is not attempting to write another Gospel but to go beyond the outward words and deeds of Jesus to their inward

---

(footnote 51 continued) Veritatis och Nya Testamentet," *Rel. Bib.*, 17 (1958), 54-70, and K. H. Schelke, "Das Evangelium Veritatis als kanongeschichtliches Zeugnis," *B. Z.*, 5 (1961), 90-91.

[52] W. Dunn, "What Does 'Gospel of Truth' Mean?", *Vig. Chr.*, 15 (1961), 160-164, shows, by an analysis of the word ⲘⲎⲈ in the *Gospel* of Truth, that "Truth" in the title is synonymous with "Jesus." This is certainly correct since the "truth" is the essence of what Christ has revealed for salvation. Yet it is not necessary to suppose that the author used the title "the Gospel of Truth" as a cryptic expression for "theGospel of Jesus" and, therefore, as a veiled reference to the opening words of Mark, "the Gospel of Jesus Christ." In fact, the opening words of the Gnostic homily are not intended to be a title in any sense. They merely state the theme of the homily as "the truth concerning the good news which is revealed by Christ."

essence and significance for the salvation of man. In this respect the Gnostic writer has much in common with the author of the Fourth Gospel. Therefore, the term εὐαγγέλιον is used in the Gospel of Truth in the original sense of "good news" and is misunderstood by Irenaeus who uses the term only in the later sense of "written Gospel," i.e. a literary work with a definite pattern. This accounts for the conflict between what the document actually is and what Irenaeus thinks it is, thereby harmonizing the internal and external evidence for the Valentinian authorship of the Gospel of Truth.

Even if the problem of authorship is resolved in this manner, the evidence is still very meager. The external evidence of Irenaeus indicates that the Gospel of Truth is unlike the Gospels of the Apostles, and the internal evidence of language and thought places it within the context of early Valentinianism. But in the final analysis the Valentinian authorship of the Gospel of Truth rests upon the general impression which comes from viewing the document as a whole. The highly imaginative interpretation of Christianity and the exalted poetic style must have come from the hand of a creative thinker who was not limited to the traditional language of the Church. Thus, the Christian coloration of the document and its early presentation of Gnosticism without the later mythological elaboration seem to present a fresh picture of the teaching of Valentinus himself from about A.D. 150. This will provide a "working hypothesis" for the comparison of the thought of the Gospel of Truth and the Fourth Gospel.

The main difficulty that strikes even the casual reader of the Gnostic writing is the lack of a systematic progression of thought in the work. Since the document is in the literary form of a "homily," various themes are introduced and discussed, but they are not arranged in anything like a systematic order. This difficulty can be at least partially overcome by presenting a unified picture of the leading ideas in the Gospel of Truth which have their root in the Fourth Gospel.

CHAPTER TWO

A COMPARISON OF THE LEADING IDEAS

The Gospel of John has long been considered the profoundest and most satisfying interpretation of the life of Christ. It is not only a historical narrative but also a theological interpretation. The outward events are thus made transparent so that one can see through the earthly facts to their inward and eternal meaning. Since the spiritual insight of the author penetrates into the real meaning of the life of Christ, multitudes of readers have come to treasure this Gospel as the most inspiring of all books. This extensive appreciation for the Fourth Gospel, however, does not alleviate the intensive problems which are connected with it.

It is not within the scope of the present study to seek a solution to the Johannine problem. The limitations of space obviously make it impossible to present a thorough analysis of the complex problem of authorship.[53] Therefore, it will be necessary to refer to the author as "John" without being dogmatic about which John or how much of the work of the Apostle John is present in the Gospel. The question of date is not as difficult. This is the one point in modern Johannine research on which there has been increasing agreement. The older view which placed the Gospel near the end of the second century has been disproven by the discoveries in 1935 of the Rylands Papyrus P^{52} and the Egerton Papyrus 2 which give evidence that the Fourth Gospel was known in the first half of the second century.[54] The limits within which the book must lie are fixed by John's use of the Gospel of Luke[55] and by the use of Johannine thought by Ignatius,[56] i.e. between A.D. 85 and 115. When time is allowed for the Gospel of Luke to be assimilated by John and for the Gospel of John to be disseminated to Ignatius at Antioch, the limits can probably be reduced to A.D. 90-100 .[57] If the Fourth Gospel can be dated in the last decennium of the first century, then it is separated from the Gospel of Truth by a span of about fifty years, thus allowing plenty of time for its presentation of the life of Christ to have influenced the thought of Valentinus. A comparison of the thought of the Gospel of John with the thought of the Gospel of Truth means that one of the latest documents of the New Testament will be compared with one of the earliest documents of Gnosticism. Such a glimpse into the middle of the second century has three distinct advantages. a) It will allow Gnosticism to speak for itself at a time when the problem of orthodoxy and heresy had not yet become acute. b) It will give new insight into the seriousness of the subtle threat which this kind of early Gnostic doctrine posed for the Church Fathers. c) It will present a clearer picture of the basic ingredients from which the later Gnostic system of the followers of Valentinus was developed. Therefore, the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Gospel of Truth promises to throw new light on the development of early Christian theology at about A.D. 150.

---

[53] E. F. Scott, The Literature of the New Testament (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932), pp. 324-235, presents a useful summary of the five distinct approaches to the problem of authorship in modern Johannine research. Cf. H. P. V. Nunn, The Fourth Gospel: An Outline of the Problem and Evidence (London: Tyndale Press, 1946), and The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel (Oxford: Alden and Blackwell, 1952).

---

[54] C. H. Roberts, *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library* (Manchester: University Press, 1935), and H. I. Bell and T. C. Skeat, *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel and Other Early Christian Papyri* (London: British Museum, 1935). Cf. W. G. Kümmel, "Textkritik und Textgeschichte des Neuen Testaments, 1914-1937," *T. Ru.*, N. F. 10 (1938), 293-327, insbes. 293-295.

[55] B. F. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1924), pp. 395-426. Cf. F. Büchsel, "Johannes und die Synoptiker," *Z. syst. Th.*, 4, (1926-27), 240-265; F. C. Grant, "Was the Author of John Dependent upon the Gospel of Luke?" *J. B. L.*, 56 (1937), 285-307; and P. Gardner-Smith, *St. John and the Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge: University Press, 1938).

[56] Christian Maurer, *Ignatius von Antiochien und das Johannesevangelium* (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1949), S. 44-99. The view of Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (London: A. and C. Black, 1931), pp. 348-369, that the Fourth Gospel represents a further development of the theology of Ignatius is now disproven by the discovery of the Rylands and Egerton papyrus fragments.

[57] A. H. McNeile, *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, Revised by C. S. C. Williams (2nd edition; Oxford: Clarenden Press, 1953), p. 293. R. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (14. Auflage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956), S. 203, Anm. 4, agrees with this conclusion and asserts that the Fourth Gospel must have been known in Egypt about 100 A.D., basing his view largely upon the evidence of the Rylands and Egerton papyrus fragments. Cf. P. H. Menoud, *L'Évangile de Jean d'après les recherches récentes* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1943), pp. 5-9 (hereafter abbreviated P. H. Menoud, *L'Évangile de Jean*), W. F. Howard, *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation*, Revised by C. K. Barrett (4th edition; London: Epworth Press, 1955), pp. 19-91 and 243-267 (hereafter abbreviated W.F. Howard, *The Fourth Gospel*); and W. F. Albright, "Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of John" in C. H. Dodd's *Festschrift* (1956), pp. 153-171.

The situation is made more complicated by the limited evidence concerning the early use of the Gospel of John by the orthodox writers of the Church. Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., III, 3,4) takes pains to discuss the contact of Polycarp (c. A.D. 90) with John, the beloved disciple, from whose own lips the bishop of Smyrna had heard the truth about Christ. The Letters of Ignatius (c. A.D. 115), bishop of Antioch, can only be understood against the background of the Fourth Gospel. Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., III, 39) records the view of Papias (c. A.D. 140), bishop of Hierapolis, which distinguishes between John, "the Lord's disciple" and the elder John. The Diatessaron of Tatian (c. A.D. 170) gives evidence of the use of the Fourth Gospel just past the middle of the second century. The Apologies and

Dialogue of Justin Martyr (c. A.D. 151-165) quote the Fourth Gospel very loosely but show a profound understanding of the *Logos* doctrine. Theophilus of Antioch (c. A.D. 180) specifically ascribes the Fourth Gospel to "John" (*Ad Autolycum*, II, 22).[58] Irenaeus (c. A.D. 180), bishop of Lyons, is the first orthodox writer to defend seriously its apostolic authority and to interpret systematically its theology (*Adv. Haer.*, III, 11,8 *et al.*). By this time the Gospel of John is clearly recognized as one of the four divinely appointed pillars of evangelical truth.

The prominent place which Irenaeus gives to the theology of the Gospel of John grows out of his encounter with Gnosticism. The fact that the Valentinian Gnostics were looking to John as their favorite Gospel could not be ignored.[59] Irenaeus is particularly concerned with the early disciple of Valentinus named Ptolemy (c. A.D. 170-180) whose exegesis of the Johannine Prologue (*Adv. Haer.*, I, 8,5) is an attempt to provide a Biblical basis for his entire Valentinian system of thought (*Adv. Haer.*, I, 1,1 - I, 8,4). In the course of presenting the views of another Valentinian Gnostic called Marcus the Magician, Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.*, III, 11,7) attests the Valentinian misuse of the Fourth Gospel.

> Those who follow Valentinus, making copious use of the Gospel of John in order to illustrate their syzygies, shall be proved to be totally in error by means of their very Gospel, as I have shown in the first book.

Thus, Irenaeus uses the Gospel of John itself to disprove the Gnostic system of thought which depends so heavily upon it.

---

[58] J. N. Sanders, *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church: Its Origin and Influence on Christian Theology up to Irenaeus* (Cambridge: University Press, 1943), esp. p. 35, note 1, ignores the earlier use of the Fourth Gospel in the Church and begins his discussion with Theophilus of Antioch.

[59] W. von Loewenich, *Das Johannes-Verständnis im zweiten Jahrhundert* (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1932), S. 69-101, and Maurice F. Wiles, *The Spiritual Gospel: The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (Cambridge: University Press, 1960), pp. 96-111, have admirably accumulated the evidence for the use of the Fourth Gospel among the Valentinian Gnostics.

The resistance of the Church to the Valentinian use of the Fourth Gospel is continued by Clement of Alexandria (c. A.D. 193). His attention is focused on "Extracts from the Works of Theodotus and the So-Called Oriental Teaching at the Time of Valentinus" (Strom., VIII, 1, et al.). Usually referred to as the Excerpta ex Theodoto, the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel which it contains deals specifically with the Prologue Exc. 6-7, 13, and 41) and also with the Gospel in general (Exc. 3, 16, 22, 26, 35, 61-62, 65, and 73). By exposing the Valentinian misrepresentation of Johannine thought, Clement attempts to restore the honorable title "Gnostic" to its proper place within the Church.

The work of Clement of Alexandria is continued by Origen (c. A.D. 231). In his Commentary on St. John Origen quotes another follower of Valentinus named Heracleon nearly fifty times (Com. on John, II, 8, 15, et al.). In this way large sections of Heracleon's interpretation of John 1, 2, 4, and 8 have been preserved. The chief interest in Heracleon (c. A.D. 170-180), a contemporary of Ptolemy, is due to the fact that he is the earliest commentator on the Gospel of John. Although Origen usually takes issue with him by calling his method "forced" or "strained," he occasionally accepts his exposition since he is an allegorizer himself.

It has long been a puzzle to Biblical scholars that the Fourth Gospel was first recognized, read, and exegeted by the Valentinian Gnostics. Until the discovery of the Nag Hammadi library in 1945, the use of the Gospel of John by Valentinus himself (A.D. 136-160) could be presumed only from the later efforts of his followers. A complete manuscript of what appears to be his own composition is now available to fill the gap. This newly discovered Gospel of Truth is clearly dependent upon the Gospel of

John for much of its thought and vocabulary.[60] Therefore, the early acceptance of the Fourth Gospel by the Valentinian Gnostics at least indicates that they found in it something that was akin to their way of thinking. Perhaps the compatibility of certain aspects of Johannine thought with Gnosticism explains why the Fourth Gospel was so late in being accepted by the orthodox Church and why the orthodox writers soon found it necessary to insist upon the apostolic authority of the work. Otherwise, how could Christians be edified by a Gospel which had found such wide acceptance in Gnostic circles? Irenaeus was apparently the first theologian to give a satisfactory answer to the question by properly interpreting the Johannine synthesis between historical fact and theological interpretation. In this way he was able to use the Fourth Gospel itself as his most powerful weapon in the fight against the Gnostic heresy.

The relationship between the Fourth Gospel and the Gospel of Truth need no longer be the object of mere speculation.[61] In a detailed analysis of the verbal "echoes" from the New Testament in the Gospel of Truth,

---

[60] C. K. Barrett, "The Theological Vocabulary of the Fourth Gospel and of the Gospel of Truth" in Otto A. Piper's Festschrift, pp. 210-223, has presented the first discussion of this specific problem. Unfortunately the limitations of space forced him to confine his discussion to the minor theological vocabulary which the two documents share in common (such as "sent," "glory," "judgment," "love," "life," and "light") and prevented him from including in the essay any discussion of the terms "son," "word," "truth," or "knowledge" (p. 222, note 27). The present writer prefers to begin with a comparison of the major theological vocabulary of the two documents and then to discuss the terms that remain in the larger context of the way of salvation. (Mention should also be made of the earlier work of G. Quispel which compares the Gospel of John with the Gospel of Truth from the standpoint of their common affinity to Jewish thought - G. Quispel, "Het Johannesevangelium en de Gnosis," Ned. T. Ts., 11 (1957), 173-203, translated into French as "L'Évangile de Jean et la Gnose" in M.-É. Boismard, L'Évangile de Jean (1958), pp. 197-208.)

[61] J. Kreyenbühl, Das Evangelium der Wahrheit: Neue Lösung der johanneischen Frage, 2 Bände (Berlin: C.A. Schwetschke und Sohn, 1900-1905), drew the fantastic conclusion that the Valentinian "Gospel of Truth" mentioned by Irenaeus (Adv. Hear., III, 11,9) was in reality the canonical Gospel of John which was presumably written by a Gnostic.

W. C. van Unnik[62] lists over twice as many allusions to the Gospel of John than he does to any other New Testament writing. His entire treatment is based on _the method of comparing words_ which has definite limitations. The natural tendency is to conclude that every phrase which sounds like an echo of something in the Fourth Gospel is in fact derived from it. This tendency can only be kept under control when the comparison of mere words and phrases points beyond itself to the larger similarities and differences of thought. Since the Gospel of Truth does not quote directly from any part of the New Testament, the task of comparing the thought of the Fourth Gospel and the Gospel of Truth is much more difficult than would appear on the surface. The main resemblances are not found in the strict sense of literary borrowings as much as in a similar approach to the theological perspective which the Gnostic writer shares with the Fourth Evangelist. For this reason the method of comparing words which can only reveal similarities of style and structure is certainly not adequate for the task.

The alternative to the method of comparing words is _the method of comparing ideas_. In the latter approach the emphasis will be placed on a comparison of the theological perspective of the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth in an attempt to discover the underlying mentality of the two documents. This means that superficial similarities in terminology will not obscure the significant differences in thought. In this larger framework the specific words considered will not be an end in themselves but a means to the end of unfolding the thought of the two documents.

---

[62] W. C. van Unnik in F. L. Cross, _op. cit._, pp. 115-121, lists 19 references to the Fourth Gospel and 5 references to 1 John compared with 9 for Matthew, 6 for Revelation, 4 for 1 Corinthians and Colossians, and 3 for Hebrews. Cf. M. Malinine, _op. cit._, pp. 51-60, for a total of 30 allusions to the Fourth Gospel.

This kind of comparison is especially important when dealing with the Fourth Gospel because its language is seemingly much more Gnostic than its thought.

The Fourth Gospel has a limited and distinctive vocabulary which is very small when compared with the Synoptic Gospels.[63] It omits words of local or temporary interest and puts the emphasis on a small number of elementary words and their synonyms.. A similar tendency is also found in the Gospel of Truth, since its limited vocabulary is completely devoid of topographical information. Both documents seem to be more concerned about the essential truth of the life of Jesus than in the details of his earthly ministry. This common interest apparently accounts for the prominent use of the Fourth Gospel in the Gospel of Truth. It will be illustrated by a discussion of the leading Johannine ideas which have been accepted and assimilated into the thought of the Gospel of Truth, i.e. "the Father," "the Son," "the Logos," "the Spirit," "the Name," and "the Truth."

I. THE FATHER (ὁ πατήρ)

The characteristic way in which John speaks of God is as "the Father."[64] Whereas the name "God" (θεός) occurs seventy-three times and the name "Lord" (κύριος) occurs thirteen times, the name "Father" occurs a total of one hundred fifteen times. Such a prominent position is given to the term "Father" only in the Fourth Gospel. It occurs primarily in constructions such as "the Father" and "my Father" or simply "Father." There is only one occurrence of the phrase "your Father" (John 20:17), whereas the phrase "our Father" does not occur at all. The term also appears in such combinations as "the living Father" (John 6:57), "holy Father" (John 17:11), and "righteous Father" (John 17:25). The comparison of the Johannine teaching with the Gospel of Truth calls for a consideration of the continuous work of the Father, the relationship between the Father and His children, and the comprehensive meaning of the doctrine of God.

---

[63] E. A. Abbott, Johannine Vocabulary: A Comparison of the Words of the Fourth Gospel with Those of the Three (London: A. and C. Black, 1905), pp. 161-187 and 195-239 (hereafter abbreviated E.A. Abbott, Johannine Vocabulary), gives a list of the "Synoptic words comparatively seldom or never used by John," thus indicating the smallness of the Johannine vocabulary, as well as a list of "Johannine words comparatively seldom or never used by the Synoptics," thereby isolating the distinctive Johannine vocabulary and providing a basis of comparison with the vocabulary of the Gnostic writing.

[64] G. Schrenk, πατήρ in G. Kittel's T. W. N. T., 5 (1954), 996-1004, insbes. 996-997. Cf. G. B. Stevens, The Johannine Theology: A Study of the Doctrinal Contents of the Gospel and Epistles of the Apostle John (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1894), pp. 46-73 (hereafter abbreviated G. B. Stevens, (continued next page)

(1) The Continuous Work of the Father. In his use of the term "Father" John presupposes the sublime majesty of the Hebrew conception of God (e.g. Isaiah 57:15). Hebrew thought is concerned with the conception of the divine nature not as abstract being but as the source of active forces operative in the world. The creative activity of God is especially prominent in the Fourth Gospel in connection with the charge of Sabbath-breaking which is brought against Jesus after healing the infirm man at Bethesda.

> But Jesus answered them, "My Father is working (ἐργάζεται) still, and I am working (ἐργάζομαι) .... Truly, truly, I say to you, the Son can do nothing of his own accord, but only what he sees the Father doing; for whatever he does, that the Son does likewise" (John 5:17 and 19).

(footnote 64 continued) *Johannine Theology*); W. F. Howard, *Christianity According to St. John* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1946), pp. 57-80; E. K. Lee, *The Religious Thought of St. John* (London: S. P. C. K., 1950), pp. 32-55; J. Giblet, "Jésus et 'le Père' dans le IV^{e} Évangile" in M. É. Boismard *L'Évangile de Jean; Études et Problèmes* (Louvain: Desclée de Brouwer, 1958), pp. 111-130 (hereafter abbreviated M.-É. Boismard, *L'Évangile de Jean*); and F.-M. Braun, *Jean le Théologien et son évangile dans l'église ancienne* (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1959), pp. 113-114.

In sharp contrast to the dialectic of work and rest in Jewish orthodoxy, the identity of work and rest is presupposed by Jesus in the Gospel of John. This identity means that the rest of God after the creation, which is outwardly represented by the Sabbath, is not a state of inaction but of activity. The work of the Father includes the maintenace of the material creation as well as the redemption and restoration of all things, in which the Son cooperates with Him. Christ thus views his work as co-ordinate with that of the Father and not as dependent on it. This type of reasoning appears to be a kind of syllogism:

> God is essentially and unchangeably creative; what God does Jesus does also; therefore, Jesus also works.

The Jews rightly understood the reply of Jesus as a claim to equality with God (John 5:18). The subsequent discourse of Jesus is, therefore, an explanation of the complete unity of action between the Father and the Son (John 5:19-47). Although the Father is the one true spring of life and of righteous judgment, He commits both the bestowal of life and the responsibility of judgment to the Son. Thus, the activity of Jesus can only be claimed as a revelation of the Father on the ground that Jesus never acts independently of Him. What he does is always a reflection of God's own work. The work of Christ on the Sabbath is acknowledged in the Synoptic Gospels (Matt. 12:11-12; Mk. 3:4; Lk. 6:9; 13:14-16; 14:3-5), but John alone sees it as an expression of the continuous activity of the Father. In the Fourth Gospel it is the acknowledgment of the working together of the Father and the Son on the Sabbath which brings Jesus into conflict with the Jews.

The author of the Gospel of Truth clearly accepts the Johannine teaching concerning the continuous work of the Father in the course of commenting on the Parable of the Lost Sheep.

p. 31,35 He (= Christ) is the shepherd
who left behind the ninety-
p. 32,1 nine sheep which had not strayed,
went in search of that one which
had strayed, (and) rejoiced when he
had found it. For ninety-nine
5 is a number which is in the left hand
which holds it (= the number). But
(at) the moment
when one is found,
the whole number
passes over to the right (hand). Thus
(it is also with)
10 him who lacks the one, that
is, the entire right (hand) which
attracts that in which it was deficient (= 99),
seizes it from the
left side, and transfers (it) to the
15 right, and in this way the number
becomes one hundred. The sign of that which
is in their voice (= the meaning of the words) is
the Father. This one
worked even (κἄν) on the Sabbath (σάββατον)
for the sheep
which he had found after it had fallen into the
20 pit. He saved the life
of that sheep by having brought it up
from the pit in order that you, the children of
understanding, may
know what the Sabbath (σάββατον) is,
that (day) on which it is not fitting for the
(work of) salvation to be idle.

This passage contains a curious combination of the Synoptic Parable of the Lost Sheep (Matt. 18:12-14; Lk. 15:4-7) and the Johannine statement concerning Christ's work on the Sabbath (John 5:17), both of which are reinterpreted from a Gnostic point of view. The Gnostic interpretation of the parable emphasizes the fact that the "pneumatics" (= the lost sheep) stray into the region of forgetfulness and error (p. 31,35 - p. 32,4). The overcoming of the true Gnostic's temporary lost condition in a state of forgetfulness is illustrated by means of an old method of counting, according to which the shift from 99 to 100 indicates a change from the left hand to the right (p. 32,4-16). For the true Gnostic this shift means a change from deficiency (= 99) to fulness or perfection (= 100) which is made possible by the discovery of the divine origin of his existence in the Father. Man's new condition of perfection is possible because of the continuous work of the Father which takes place even on the Sabbath (p. 32,16-25). Nowhere else in the Gospel of Truth is there a closer parallel to the thought of the Gospel of John than in the latter part of this passage. Taking his inspiration from the Fourth Gospel, the author of the Gospel of Truth concludes that "the Sabbath is that (day) on which it is not fitting for the (work of) salvation to be idle" (p. 32,23-25). The implication is that God's work of salvation is a continuous process by which the life which comes from the divine root flows in an unimpeded way into the individual. Such a conclusion is possible because the Gnostic writer clearly accepts the teaching of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel - "My Father is working still" (ὁ πατήρ μου ἕως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται), i.e. right through the Sabbath (John 5:17) - and has assimilated it into his homily in almost identical language - "The Father...worked even on the Sabbath" (ⲡⲓⲱⲧ ⲁϥⲣ̄ϩⲱⲃ ⲁⲣⲁϥ ⲕⲁⲛ ϩⲛ̄ ⲯⲁⲃⲁⲧⲧⲟⲛ) (p. 32,17-18 and 20). Therefore, in contrast to the dialectic of work and rest in Jewish orthodoxy, both the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth identify the Sabbath "rest" with the "work" of the Father in the Son.

(2) The Father and His Children. The Gospel of John not only understands God as the Father whose continuous activity is expressed in the work of the Son but also as the Father who seeks a loving response from the lives of His children. The usual Johannine phrase for those who respond to God's love is "children (τέκνα) of God" (John 1:12; 11:52; cf. John 8:39). There is also one occurrence of the phrase "sons (υἱοί) of light" (John 12:36). The experience of intimate fellowship with the Father

is available only to those who "become children of God" (τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι) by believing on the name of Christ (John 1:12; cf. 1 John 3:1), and this relationship with the Father is sustained and strengthened by worship (John 4:23) and prayer (John 15:16; 16:23). The condition for salvation is thus described as a spiritual begetting by the Father which results from man's faith in Christ. Although sin and disobedience cause men to forfeit their fellowship with the Father, this relationship is restored by the act of believing in His Son, Jesus Christ. In the Fourth Gospel all men are potentially children of God, but this divine privilege actually becomes theirs only through an act of faith in Christ. Those who do not accept this privilege are already condemned and belong to "their father the Devil" (τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου) (John 8:44; cf. John 3:18). Therefore, the Fourth Gospel divides all men into two classes: (1) those who choose to become children of God by believing on Christ; and (2) those who choose to become children of the Devil by not believing on Christ.

The Gospel of Truth uses the term ϢⲎⲢⲈ in the plural a total of six times for the recipients of the revelation of the Father (p. 27,13-14; p. 32,38; p. 33,39; p. 38,28; p. 43,20 and 22). Instead of the Johannine expression "children of God" (John 1:12; 11:52), the Gospel of Truth has "the children of the Father" (Ⲛ̄ϢⲎⲢⲈ Ⲙ̄ⲠⲒⲰⲦ) (p. 33,39; cf. p. 43,20 and 22). Whereas John insists that men become children of God by believing on the "name" (ὄνομα) of Christ (John 1:12), the Gnostic writer avoids the idea of faith by using the expression "children of the name" (ϨⲚ̄ϢⲎⲢⲈ Ⲙ̄ⲠⲢⲈⲚ) (p. 38,28; cf. p. 32,38). Those who acknowledge the name of Christ and receive the knowledge of their divine origin in the Father are called "the perfect ones" (Ⲛ̄ⲚⲈⲦϪⲎⲔ)

(p. 18,14; cf. 1 Cor. 14:20) who go to the very limit of their potentialities because they "are truly in Him" (p. 27,23-25). Such men are likened to emanations who know the Father because they come from Him like "children" (ϩⲛ̄ϣⲏⲣⲉ) come from a perfect man (p. 27,11-14). This self-awareness of the divine origin of one's existence is what the Father desires for all men. Although ignorance and error temporarily constrict the awareness of his divine origin, man overcomes this deficiency by discovering his true existence in the Father. Thus, these men are actually children of God who come to realize that they have their "root" in the Father.

Nevertheless, it is recognized in the Gospel of Truth that not all men respond in such a positive way to the Father's desire for them to find their true existence in Him. Some are said to be "in Him" (p. 28,1) without knowing it and are referred to as "those who do not yet exist" (p. 27,32-35). Their nebulous position of neither "existing" nor "not-existing" causes them to be labelled "those of the middle" (ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲧⲙⲏⲧⲉ) (p. 17,35).[65] While the Father seeks to claim them for Himself, Error seeks to beguile them and to take them captive (p. 17,32). Since those in this category have the possibility of coming to know their divine origin or of remaining in ignorance, they are of primary importance to the author of the Gospel of Truth.

---

[65] The enigmatic phrase "those of the middle" (p. 17,35) later comes to mean the "psychics" in the fully developed Valentinian system, i.e. men of "soul" who are in the middle between the "pneumatics" and the "hylics" in Gnostic anthropology. These three classes of men are a typical feature of Valentinian Gnosis: "Therefore many are material, but not many are psychic, and few are spiritual. Now the spiritual is saved by nature, but the psychic has free-will and has the capacity for both faith and incorruptibility, as well as for unbelief and corruption according to its own choice; but the material perishes by nature" (Exc. Theod., 56,2-3).

There is also another class of men in the Gospel of Truth who are impervious to the Father and prefer to identify themselves with Error. Those who belong to this group are characterized as men who have "no root" (p. 28,16), implying that they do not really experience true existence. Instead, they share with Error its "hylic substance" (ὕλη) which originated because of not knowing the truth (p. 17,15-17). This means that they have a "material" nature which is completely ignorant of the Father.

p. 30,36 When many had received
the light, they turned
p. 31,1 to Him (= the Father), whereas (those who were)
material (ὕλη) (= the non-Gnostic)
were alien (to Him) (= were not known by him)
and did not discern His form
3 and did not come to know Him.

Those who possess this "material" nature do not have the capacity for salvation and thus remain in their condition of ignorance. Such person become a "dwelling-place" (τόπος) of the Devil (p. 33,19-20).

Therefore, three classes of man can be distinguished in the Gnostic writing: (a) those who have knowledge, i.e. the true Gnostics; (b) those who are in the middle, i.e. the potential Gnostics, and (c) those who are ignorant, i.e. the non-Gnostics. The contrast with the Fourth Gospel is apparent in terms of the formal structure of the anthropology of the two documents and in terms of the theological meaning of predestination. In the Gospel of John there are two classes of men: (a) those who believe on Christ, i.e. the Christians, and (b) those who do not believe, i.e. the non-Christians. Even more important is the difference in the understanding of predestination. In the Fourth Gospel the election of God is balanced by the free will of man. This view is in sharp contrast to the one-sided doctrine of predestination in the Gospel of Truth in which the true Gnostic is foreordained to salvation and the non-Gnostic to destruction. If there is any possibility of personal control over one's fate in the Gnostic document, it is limited to the intermediate class of potential Gnostics.

(3) The Doctrine of God. The term "Father" also plays an important part in the comprehensive understanding of the doctrine of God. In the Fourth Gospel the doctrine of God is largely functional and practical rather than metaphysical. The closest that John comes to a metaphysical conception of the Deity is in the description of the nature of God as "spirit" (πνεῦμα ὁ θεός), i.e. God is above all limitations of time and space (John 4:24). God is also described as being invisible - "No one has ever seen God" (θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε) (John 1:18a; cf. John 5:37). In other words, He reveals himself to man not by making an immediate impression of Himself on their senses but by manifesting His will and nature to them in the person of the only begotten Son (John 1:18b). The contrast is between the invisible God who is hidden to the senses of man and the loving Father who is revealed in His grace and truth through His Son, Jesus Christ. Therefore, it is as "spirit" that the Father reveals Himself to the senses of men through the Incarnation of His Son, and this form of revelation by which the invisible God becomes known is in accord with His divine nature as "spirit."

The spiritual, invisible God is also described as "the only true God" (τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν) (John 17:3; cf. John 5:44 and 1 John 5:20). God is "true" because there is nothing in Him that is only potential; every aspect of His Being is actual and is fully developed. He is the "only" God because He alone is the One who is revealed in Jesus Christ. In contrast to all anthropomorphic ideas of God He is presented in the Fourth Gospel as the invisible, absolute Spirit, and in contrast to all polytheistic conceptions He is described as the one and only Being who corresponds to the true idea of Deity. This is as far as John goes in discussing the attributes which comprise the metaphysical nature of the Deity. Yet even when discussing what God is in Himself, John puts the main emphasis upon the way in which the Father manifests Himself to man in the life of His Son.

This functional approach to the doctrine of God dominates the description of His nature as "love" (ἀγάπη) (John 17:26; cf. 1 John 4:7-8) and "light" (φῶς) (John 1:4-5 and 9; 3:19-21; 8:12; cf. 1 John 1:5). "Love" designates the Father as existing and acting on the basis of goodness and mercy in relation to His Son (John 3:35; 5:20; 17:24), in relation to the world (John 3:16), and in relation to the believer (John 14:23; 16:27; 17:23). "Light" is the principle or impulse of self-revelation in the Father which banishes the darkness of sin from the lives of men and enables them to participate in His glory. The same functional approach also appears in the references to the Father as the One who is "holy" (ἅγιος) (John 17:11; cf. 1 John 2:20) and "righteous" (δίκαιος) (John 17:25; cf. 1 John 1:9, 2:29). As the One who is "holy," He is separate from all that is sinful and wrong; as the One who is "righteous," He will not let sin persist in the world without retribution and judgment. Instead of dwelling on the holiness of God, John says that the Father gives the responsibility for the bestowal of life and the execution of judgment to the Son (John 5:21-27). Therefore, the entire discussion of the Johannine doctrine of God presupposes that there is nothing in the life of the Son that does not have its root in the activity of the Father. The inner relationship of the Father and the Son is the heart and center of the

Johannine proclamation of salvation, and it is beautifully expressed by the simple assertion that "the Father loves the Son and has given all things into his hand" (John 3:35). This "love" (ἀγάπη) of the Father for His Son receives its deepest expression in the sacrifice of Christ on the cross (John 3:16). By taking his starting point from the Hebrew emphasis on the activity of God, John's understanding of the doctrine of God is closely related to his understanding of soteriology and Christology. Thus, the Fourth Gospel views God primarily as the Father who desires men to become His sons and who sends him who is the Son to make it possible for all men to come to know Him. The attributes of God are treated as if they were relatively unimportant. In this way John avoids a theoretical discussion of cosmology which emphasizes the metaphysical nature of God and concentrates almost exclusively on the activity of God which expresses itself in terms of soteriology and Christology.

The description of the Godhead in the Gospel of Truth appears eighty-eight times as "the Father" (ⲠⲒⲰⲦ), making it the most frequently used term in the entire document. The name "God" (ⲚⲞⲨⲦⲈ) occurs twice (p. 34,28; p. 37,33), and the name "Lord" (ϪⲀⲈⲒⲤ) likewise occurs twice (p. 40,8 and 14; cf. p. 38,38). In addition to "the Father," the term also appears in such expressions as "the Father of Truth" (ⲠⲒⲰⲦ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲦⲘⲎⲈ) (p. 16,33) which is reminiscent of the Johannine phrase "the true God" (τὸν ἀληθινὸν θεόν) (John 17:3; cf. 1 John 5:20) and "the Father of the All" (ⲠⲒⲰⲦ Ⲙ̄ⲠⲦⲎⲢϤ̄) (p. 20,19) which brings to mind the Johannine statement - "All things (πάντα) were made through him (= the Logos who was one with God)" (John 1:3). In contrast to the Fourth Gospel the nature of God is described in the Gospel of Truth in terms which convey the essential characteristics of His Being. He is characterized as One who has "thought" (ⲘⲈⲈⲨⲈ) (p. 16,35; p. 19,37; p. 30,35; p. 37,1 and 8) and "mind" (νοῦς) (p. 16,36; p. 19,37; p. 37,10), two aspects of His nature which are closely associated with "depth" (βάθος) (p. 22,25; p. 35,15; p. 37,7-8; p. 40,27). All three of these attributes appear together in a striking passage which describes the self-revelation of the Father in the Logos.

> p. 37,7 Since they (= the Father's words) were (in the)
> depth (βάθος) of His thought (ⲘⲈⲈⲨⲈ), the Logos
> who was the first to come forth revealed (both)
> 10 them (= the Father's words) and a mind (νοῦς) which
> speaks the unique word in
> 12 silent grace.[66]

The implication is that the Father's words were originally submerged in the undifferentiated depth of His thought and mind before they were revealed in concrete form by the Logos. The nature of the Father is also described as "perfect" (ϪⲎⲔ) (p. 18,33; p. 42,16: cf. Matt. 5:48) and "good" (ἀγαθός and ⲚⲀⲚⲞⲨϤ) (p. 36,35; p. 43,19; cf. Matt. 19:17; Mk. 10:18; Lk. 18:19). It is striking that these two attributes reflect the influence of the Synoptic Gospels, not the Gospel of John. The contrast with the Fourth Gospel is further illustrated by the four α-privative terms which form the backbone of the doctrine of God in the Gospel of Truth. The Father is "illimitable and inconceivable" (ⲀⲦϢⲀⲦⲠϤ̄ Ⲛ̄ⲀⲦⲘⲈⲈⲨⲈ) (p. 17,7-8; p. 18,32; cf. p. 30,34) as well as "incorruptible" (ⲀⲦⲦⲈⲔⲞ) (p. 35,14) and "unbegotten" (ⲀⲦϢⲰⲠⲈ) (p. 38,33). Because He is "illimitable," He cannot be confined to the limits of time and space; because He is "inconceivable," He cannot be confined to the limits of man's mind; because He is "incorruptible," He cannot be confined to the limits of man's brief life. Moreover, His nature is entirely "unbegotten," i.e. He has no beginning since He has always been in existence. Therefore, He is described as "One who knows the spaces before they came into existence and who does not need (-χρεία) to be taught" (p. 42,8-10) and as the "One who has created the All" and who "desires that they (= the totality of the creatures of the universe) come to know Him and that they love Him" (p. 19,7-8 and 13-14). Various aspects of the Being of the Father are mentioned to show the thoroughness of His self-revelation. He reveals the Son as His "hidden self" (ΠΙΠЄΘΗΠ) (p. 24,13; p. 27,8); He reveals the Holy Spirit as His "bosom" (ΤαΠ) (p. 24,13; cf. John 1:18) and His "tongue" (λЄϹ) (p. 26,35; cf. Rom. 14:11; Phil. 2:11) which joins Him to truth which He reveals as His "mouth" (ρω) (p. 26,34; cf. Rom. 10:8-10). Whereas the terms "perfect" and "good" reflect the use of the Synoptic Gospels, the terms "truth" and "bosom" the use of the Gospel of John, the terms "tongue" and "mouth" the Epistles of Paul, the author of the Gospel of Truth adds his own distinctive emphasis by using the speculative terms "depth, thought, and mind," the psychological term "hidden self," and the α-privative terms "illimitable, inconceivable, incorruptible, and unbegotten" with reference to the Father. Because the author of the Gospel of Truth is not satisfied with a purely functional and practical use of the term "Father" as it appears in the Fourth Gospel, he proceeds to add his own metaphysical dimension. Thus, the starting point in the Gospel of Truth is cosmology, not Christology and soteriology as in the Gospel of John. This is why the Gospel of Truth places so much emphasis upon the attributes which convey the essential characteristics of the Father's Being, whereas the subject is largely avoided in the Gospel of John.

---

[66] This passage is even more significant when it is compared with the later system of the disciples of Ptolemy (Irenaeus, Adv. Haer., I,1,1; I,11,1 et passim) where βάθος is the highest Aeon in the Pleroma, from whom proceed the Aeons ἔννοια and νοῦς. In the Gospel of Truth "depth," "thought," and "mind" are attributes of God, and there is no suggestion of their independence from Him as Aeons.

The influence of the Fourth Gospel is undeniable in the use of the term "Father" as the main designation for the Godhead in the Gospel of Truth. The similarity, however, is mainly in the realm of the function of the Father in relation to the Son and to man, not in the realm of metaphysics. Whereas John writes under the predominant influence of the Hebrew concept of God as One who acts in history, the author of the Gospel of Truth is more inclined toward the Hellenistic understanding of God which emphasizes His nature and Being.

Closely related to the idea of the Father in both the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth is the idea of the Son. Although it has already been hinted at in the previous discussion, the subject is important enough in the thought of both documents to demand separate consideration.

II. THE SON (ὁ υἱός)

The idea of "the Son" is used to describe the absolute relation of divine persons - the relationship of the Son to the Father - in contrast to the idea of "the Son of God" or "the Son of Man" which emphasize the divine or human nature of Christ in relation to man. This unique Sonship of Jesus in relation to the Father, or Jesus' inward certainty of a unique filial consciousness, is a basis theme of the Fourth Gospel.[67] The term υἱός occurs seventeen times as "the Son" (ὁ υἱός) (John 3:17 and 35-36; 5:19-26; 6:40; 8:35-36; 14:13; 17:1) and three times as "the only Son" (ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός) (John 1:18; 3:16 and 18; cf. 1:14). These two usages will provide the basis for a consideration of the Johannine teaching concerning the relationship between the Father and the Son and the unique position of the only Son in relation to the Father.

---

[67] G. B. Stevens, *Johannine Theology*, pp. 102-126; W. F. Lofthouse, "Fatherhood and Sonship in the Fourth Gospel," *Exp. T.*, 43 (1931/32), 442-448, and *The Father and the Son: A Study in Johannine Thought* (London: S. C. M. Press, 1934); and Dale Moody, "God's Only Son: The Translation of John 3:16 in the Revised Standard Version," *J. B. L.*, 72 (1953), 213-219.

(1) The Father and the Son. In the Gospel of John Jesus never refers to God as "our Father" but only as "the Father" or "my Father." This Johannine use of the possessive pronoun points to the close relation between the Father and the Son. Jesus teaches men to think of God as Father because he himself is His Son, and he calls men to a life of "sonship" because he himself lives a life of "Sonship" in relation to the Father. Although the Father is always "the greater one" (μεῖζον or μείζων) (John 10:29; 14:28), the Son knows His will, obeys it, and honors the Father (John 15:10). This perfect obedience is an expression of the inner unity between the Father and the Son (John 10:30 and 38). In other words, everything that the Father has belongs to the Son (John 16:15; 17:10); He confers full authority on the Son (John 3:35; 5:22-23) and honors what the Son does (John 12:26; 14:21). The Son thus becomes the sole appointed mediator of the Father (John 14:6 and 9) in order that "the world" (ὁ κόσμος) might be saved through him (John 3:17). This contrast between God and the world is essential to the thought of the Fourth Gospel. The world is not divine by virtue of the fact that God created it; it must be redeemed by the work of the Son. The knowledge which the Son displays and the marvelous power which he exercises are not inherent in Jesus but are given to him by the Father.

The author of the Gospel of Truth also uses the term "Son" to express the filial relationship of Jesus with the Father. It appears a total of eleven times, of which ten occur simply as "the Son" (ⲠϢⲎⲢⲈ)

(p. 24,14; p. 30,25; p. 38,7-24; p. 39,19-26; p. 40,25) and one occurs as "the beloved Son" (ⲠϢⲢ̄ⲘⲚ̄ⲢⲒⲦ) (p. 30,31; cf. p. 40,24-25). Whereas the prevailing usage reflects the Johannine expression ὁ υἱός , the one exception has its parallel in the Synoptic Gospels where the phrase "my beloved Son" (ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός) occurs eight times (Matt. 3:17; 17:5; Mk. 1:11; 9:7; 12:6; Lk. 3:22; 9:35; 20:13). The mystery of salvation in the Gospel of Truth is described as the revelation of the Father's "hidden self" (ⲠⲒⲠⲈⲐⲎⲦ) in the form of the Son (p. 24,13; p. 27,8) and as the giving of "His name" (ⲠⲈϤⲢⲈⲚ) or His divine essence to the Son (p. 38,7, 14, 22, and 30). This unity between the Father and the Son is so strong that the Son loses his separate identity and is merely a further expression of the Being of the Father. Unlike the Fourth Gospel where the Father and the Son are clearly differentiated (John 10:29; 14:28), the Gospel of Truth discloses as the great "mystery" (μυστήριον) (p. 38,19) the fact that the Son is only an emanation of the Father.

p. 39,24 Therefore, the name belongs to the Father,
just as the name of
the Father is the Son, the compassionate (one).
For (ἐπεί) where does one have a great name
28 apart from the Father?

The true name of the Son is thus "the Father." In other words, the dinstinction between the Father and the Son is absorbed into a strictly unitarian view of God. The development of such a view indicates that the Gnostic author is interested only in the aspect of Johannine thought which emphasizes the unity between the Father and the Son, e.g. "I and the Father are one" (John 10:30) and that he completely ignores the aspect of difference, e.g. "the Father is greater than I" (John 14:28). The author of the Gospel of Truth is apparently influenced by the Johannine teaching that the name of the Father is given to the Son (John 17:6 and 11), thereby suggesting that God's essential nature as Father is revealed in the Incarnate Son. In fact, the relationship between the Father and the Son is so close in the Gospel of Truth that it can be said that "the Father became a quiet and devoted guide" in the person of the Son (p. 19,17-18) or that "the beloved Son ... appeared to teach them concerning the illimitable Father" (p. 30,31-34). The Gnostic writing, however, views this relationship from the standpoint of the Son who is the principle of cosmic order which emanates from the Father, not from the standpoint of the Son who comes into the world in the form of human flesh. The contrast between God and the world is no longer apparent. In the Gospel of Truth the world is divine because God created it, and the world thus has its origin in God. The Son is able to mediate between God and the world because of the fact that he partakes of both of them, i.e. both he and the world have their common root in the Father. The influence of John is also seen in the Son's desire to "glorify" (ⲉⲁⲩ) the greatness of His Father's name (p. 41, 1-2; cf. John 17:1 and 4-5) and to open up a way of "returning" (ⲥⲧⲟ) to the Father (p. 36,15; cf. John 14:6). The fact that the Son exists in the Father means that man's divine origin and ultimate goal is also to be found in God Himself. The appearance of Christ makes it possible for men to come to know that they too are rooted in God. The Son can truly proclaim what is in the heart of the Father (p. 20,39 - p. 21,1; p. 31,10-11; cf. John 1:18) because everything which Christ gives to man is derived from the Father (p. 31,17-20).

(2) The Only Son of God. The idea of "the Son" in the Gospel of John is tempered by the adjective μονογενής. The rendering "only begotten" somewhat obscures the exact sense of the term which is literally

"only-born," i.e. "only one of its kind" or "unique." This means that the emphasis is on the personal being of the Son rather than on his generation from the Father. Christ is thus the one to whom the title "Son" belongs in a sense which is completely unique and singular. Of the four usages of the term in the Fourth Gospel two occur in the Prologue - "as of the only (Son) (ὡς μονογενοῦς) from the Father" (John 1:14) and "the only Son (ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός) who is in the bosom of the Father" (John 1:18) - and two occur in the discourse pertaining to Nicodemus - "His only Son" (τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ) (John 3:16) and "of the only Son of God" (τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ) (John 3:18). John uses the term μονογενής to express a deep, penetrating love-relationship between a father and an only son. The modern conception of the father-son relationship is primarily physical, derived from the Greek idea which stresses bodily likeness and heredity. The Hebrew thought of being a son of something, however, is expressed by showing the quality of that something, e.g. "sons of light" (John 12:36) are those who are capable of radiating light to others. It is this Hebrew idea which dominates the Johannine understanding of Sonship by which the term μονογενής has the connotation of "partaking of the nature of the Father." The unique fellowship which Jesus has with the Father is quite naturally expressed by this Hebrew understanding of the father-son relationship.

Although the term μονογενής is not used in the Gospel of Truth, its basic meaning underlies the idea of Sonship in the Gnostic writing. If the relationship between the Father and the Son is the "only one of its kind" and reflects a "partaking of the nature of one another," then it is not difficult for the author of the Gospel of Truth to go one step further and to conclude that the Son is identical with the Father. By divorcing the Johannine teaching concerning the unity of the Father and the Son from the difference between them which is manifested in the earthly life of Jesus, the Gnostic writer arrives at a unitarian view of God who becomes aware of His "hidden self" as the Father and who reveals Himself by giving His divine essence to the Son. The Son in turn enables men to discover their true existence in the Father, so that all may be reunited with Him in perfect oneness. Thus, the Son is the one who makes it possible for men to come to know the Father (p. 16, 32-34; cf. John 17:3) and in this way to learn of their true existence in Him. It is this revelatory appearance of Christ that is redemptive. Since all men do not know that they are rooted in the Father, it is through Christ that this fact is revealed to them.

In addition to referring to Jesus as "the Son" John develops his understanding of Christology by means of the title "*Logos*." The method of comparing ideas will be continued with respect to the understanding of the *Logos* doctrine in the two documents.

III. THE LOGOS (ὁ λόγος)

Unquestionably the most discussed term in the entire Gospel of John, λόγος , occurs thirty-eight times with reference to Christ and is used in two distinct ways: it refers either to the spoken word of Christ or the revealed Word.[68]

---

[68] G. Kittel, λέγω, λόγος in G. Kittel's *T. W. N. T.*, 4 (1942), 100-140, insbes. 107-108 and 131-140. Cf. W. Baldensperger, *Der Prolog des vierten Evangeliums: Sein polemisch-apologetischer Zweck* (Freiburg i.Br.: J.C.B. Mohr, 1898); A. N. Jannaris, "St. John's Gospel and the Logos," (continued next page)

(1) The Spoken Word/s of Christ. There are thirty-four references to the spoken word/s of Christ which constitute his message to the world, of which thirty occur in the singular (e.g. John 2:22; 4:37; 12:48; 15:25) and four in the plural (John 7:40; 10:19; 14:24; 19:13). John and the Synoptics have this first usage in common, and in both cases the terms λόγος and λόγοι are used interchangeably with ῥῆμα and ῥήματα. John uses λόγος primarily in the singular and mostly in a collective sense for the whole of what Jesus said to his disciples and to the world. Except for the four occurrences of λόγοι, the common expression in the plural form is ῥήματα (e.g. John 6:63 and 68).

There are seven references to the spoken word/s of Christ in the Gospel of Truth. Using both the Greek word λόγος and its Coptic equivalent ϢⲈϪⲈ, five occur in the singular (ϢⲈϪⲈ - p. 19,20; p. 31,12; and λόγος - p. 34,35; p. 35,29; p. 27,11) and two occur in the plural (ϨⲚ̄ϢⲈϪⲈ - p. 37,3 and 4-5). In agreement with John this usage occurs primarily in the singular and in a collective sense for the whole of what Jesus said in his earthly ministry. For example, it is said that Jesus proclaimed the "word" as a teacher (p. 19,19-20) or that he proclaimed the faultless "word" (p. 31,12). The plural ϨⲚ̄ϢⲈϪⲈ adds nothing further since there is no way of determining whether it is a

---

(footnote 68 continued) *Z. N. T. W.*, 2 (1901), 13-25; E. Krebs, *Der Logos als Heiland im ersten Jahrhundert: Ein religions- und dogmengeschichtlicher Beitrag zur Erlösungslehre* (Freiburg i.Br.: Herder, 1910); F. E. Walton, *Development of the Logos-Doctrine in Greek and Hebrew Thought* (London: Simpkin Press, 1911); M. J. Lagrange, "Vers le Logos de St. Jean," *R. Bib.*, 32 (1923), 161-184 et 321-371; A. B. D. Alexander, "The Johannine Doctrine of the Logos," *Exp. T.*, 36 (1924-25), 394-399 and 467-472; J. Dillersberger, *Das Wort vom Logos: Vorlesungen über den Johannes-Prolog* (Salzburg: A. Pustet, 1935); R. G. Bury, *The Fourth Gospel and the Logos-Doctrine* (Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons, 1940); and C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: University Press, 1958), pp. 263-285.

translation of λόγοι or ῥήματα. Although the Gnostic writer could have received his inspiration for this usage from either the Synoptic Gospels or the Gospel of John, the second usage is found only in the Fourth Gospel and is the distinctive theological contribution of John.

(2) The Revealed Word. There are four references in the Gospel of John to the revealed Word as the revelation of Christ to man, all of which occur in the Prologue (John 1:1 and 14). John goes beyond the Synoptics in speaking of Jesus as the revealed Word. First of all, John thinks of Jesus as the λόγος not only in his speaking but also in his entire earthly ministry. Then he goes even farther by extending the bounds of the term to include the pre-temporal existence of the _Logos_ with God (John 1:1). The point of transition is expressed by the phrase σάρξ ἐγένετο (John 1:14) when "the Word" becomes an historical reality in the earthly life of Jesus Christ. This new meaning which John gives to the term is his distinctive contribution to the theology of the New Testament (cf. Rev. 19:13). On the one hand, John uses the term _Logos_ to express the pre-temporal existence of the "Son" with the Father. On the other hand, he uses it to explain the transition from pre-existence to history. The identification of the λόγος with the σάρξ of Jesus is an emphatic way of eliminating a docetic misunderstanding of the term once and for all.

When the _Logos_ becomes Incarnate, it does not cease to be the _Logos_, but once it has entered into its earthly existence John does not use that term any more. The new name for the _Logos_ is "Jesus Christ" (Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) (John 1:17). Since John had been enabled to see that "Jesus" of Nazareth is indeed "the Christ, the Son of God" (John 20:31), the main purpose of his Gospel is to communicate this conviction to others.

The fact that John uses the term *Logos* only in the Prologue can be explained as an attempt to catch the interest of his readers concerning a matter with which they were already familiar. This is John's way of relating the divine revelation of God to the larger Hellenistic world in which he lived. He does this by modifying the current language of the highest religious speculation to interpret a historical fact and to reveal a living person. It can be said without exaggeration that the use of the term *Logos* to refer to the eternal "Word" and to its earthly manifestation in Christ is the most radical presupposition of the entire Fourth Gospel.

There are six references to the revealed Word in the Gospel of Truth, five of which appear as ϣⲉϫⲉ (p. 16,34; p. 23,20 and 33-34; p. 26,5; p. 37,7) and one as λόγος (p. 37,8). Of particular interest is the significant passage in which two references to "the (revealed) Word" occur in connection with three references to "the (spoken) word/s."

p. 37,1 This is the perfection in the thought
of the Father, and these are
the words (ⲛⲉⲛ̄ϣⲉϫⲉ) of His reflection.
Each one of His words (ⲛⲉϥϣⲉϫⲉ)
5 is the work of His unique will
by means of the revelation (or appearance)
of His Word (ⲛⲉϥϣⲉϫⲉ). Since they were (in the)
depth (βάθος) of His thought, the Word (ⲡⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ)
who was the first to come forth revealed (both)
10 them (= the Father's words), and a mind (νοῦς) which
speaks the unique word (ⲡⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲉⲉⲓ) in
silent grace (χάρις). He (= the Word) was called
"the Thought" since they (= the Father's words)
14 were in him (= the Word) before they had been revealed.

It now becomes clear that the *Logos* who existed with the Father emerged in order to reveal two things: (a) the words of the Father which had been previously submerged in the depth of His thought, and (b) a mind which was to speak these words. Thus, the revelation of God to man is described as the speaking of the "word" or the "words" of the Father by the one who is "the Word" (= the *Logos*). He is also called "the Thought" (ΠΙΜΕΕΥΕ) because he is able to speak that which had originally existed only in the depth of his Father's mind. Moreover, what he speaks is the "word" (λόγος) of glad tidings concerning the coming of the *Pleroma* (πλήρωμα) for those who are awaiting the salvation which comes from above (p. 34,35 - p. 35,2; cf. John 3:3 and 7). It is possible for the *Logos* to communicate the Father's thought to man because he alone existed in the beginning with the Father.

The third reference to "the (revealed) Word" occurs in connection with the pre-existence of the *Logos* (p. 16,34). In the opening sentence of the homily the *Logos* is described as (a) one who is in the thought and mind (νοῦς) of the Father, (b) one who has come from the *Pleroma* (πλήρωμα), and (c) one who is called the "Saviour" (σωτήρ) (p. 16,34-36).[69] In other words, the *Logos* who was eternally with God comes forth from the divine realm in order to accomplish his work as the "Saviour."

The last three references to "the (revealed) Word" pertain to the appearance of the *Logos* (p. 23,20 and 33-34; p. 26,5). His appearance is described in the course of the beautiful poetic passage which enumerates the attributes of the Father (p. 23,18-33).

> His wisdom meditates on *the Word* (ΠΙϢΕϪΕ) ... His love is embodied (-σῶμα) in him .... *The Logos* (ΠΙϢΕϪΕ) thus goes forth from the Father into the world (lit. the All) as the fruit [of] His heart and ex-

---

[69] The order of the descriptive clauses connected with the noun *Logos* has been changed in order to clarify the progression of thought. The passage literally reads: "the *Logos* (ΠΙϢΕϪΕ) (= the Saviour) who has come from / the *Pleroma* (and) who is in the thought / and the mind of the Father; this (person) (ΠΕΕΙ) is the one who / is called the "Saviour," for this is the name of the work / which he is to accomplish for the salvation of those who / were ignorant of the Father" (p. 16,34 - p. 17,1). The demonstrative pronoun ΠΕΕΙ refers back to ΠΙϢΕϪΕ and not to the intervening ΠΙΠΛΗΡΩΜΑ, thus forming the third clause connected with the *Logos*. Cf. Walter C. Till, "Bemerkungen zur Erstausgabe des 'Evangelium Veritatis'," *Or*., n.s. 27 (1958), 269-286, insbes. 271.

pression (?) of His will (p. 23,18-20 and 30-31; p. 23,33 .- p. 24,2).

The wisdom of the Father is inaccessible to man as long as the Logos remains with Him. The inaccessibility of the Father is overcome because His love for man demands expression and takes the form of the heavenly messenger, Jesus Christ. The appearance of Christ is, therefore, the way in which the Father manifests "the fruit [of] His heart and expression of His will." This appearance of the Logos is further described in terms of "the sword" which comes to bring judgment.

> p. 25,36 For this is the judgment (κρίσις) which has come
> p. 26,1 from above (and) which has judged
> everyone as a drawn,
> two-edged sword cutting on
> this side and that.
> 5 When the Word (ⲡⲓϣⲉϫⲉ) which is in
> the heart of those who pronounce it
> had appeared (among men) - it was not only a sound
> but (ἀλλά) also took on a body (σῶμα) - a great
> disturbance occurred among
> 10 the jars (σκεῦος).

The Johannine use of κρίσις as "sunderance" (John 3:19; 12:31) is combined by the Gnostic author with the metaphor of the sundering by a two-edged sword which is the Word of God (Heb. 4:12; cf. Rev. 1:16; 2:12 and 16). Even more significant is the way in which the Logos appears on earth, i.e. not only as a "sound" which projects the words from the Father but also as a "body" (σῶμα) from which the sound comes.[70] Thus, the Gnostic writer chooses to shift the emphasis from "incarnation" to a particular kind of "ensomatosis." In this way the Johannine use of σάρξ for "human flesh" is replaced by the Gnostic use of σῶμα for "divine messenger."

---

[70] The use of σῶμα for an emanation from the Father whose likeness can be recognized provides a basis for understanding the one occurrence of the term σάρξ in the Gospel of Truth where it is said that Jesus came in "the likeness of flesh" (ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲁⲣⲝ ⲛ̄ⲥⲙⲁⲧ) (p. 31,5-6). The context itself vitiates against the Johannine meaning of the term since his flesh is further described as being "incorruptible and incoercible" (ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲧⲉⲕⲟ ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲉⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ) (p. 31,7-8), i.e. his flesh is willed by the Father and is not affected by the weakness of this world. Cf. Otto A. Piper, "Change of Perspective: Gnostic and Canonical Gospels," Interpr ., 16 (1962), 402-417, esp. 406.

The understanding of the revealed Word in the Gospel of Truth is not limited to the title Logos but also occurs in connection with the title "Jesus Christ" (p. 18,16) and the shorter titles "Jesus" (p. 20,11; p. 24,8) or "Christ" (p. 36,4). The title "Jesus Christ" (ⲒⲎ̅Ⲥ ⲠⲈⲬ̅Ⲣ̅Ⲥ̅) (p. 18,16) occurs in the course of a description of his mission as the enlightenment of those who are in "darkness"(ⲔⲈⲔⲈⲒ) by showing them the way into "knowledge" (ⲤⲀⲨⲚⲈ) (p. 18,15-29). The title "Jesus" (ⲒⲎ̅Ⲥ) (p. 24,8) occurs in a passage which describes his mission as the implementation of man's return "to the Father and the Mother" (ⲀⲠⲒⲰⲦ ⲀϨⲞⲨⲚ ⲀϮⲘⲈⲈⲨ) (p. 24,8), the latter designation being the Holy Spirit who is identified with "the bosom of the Father" (p. 24,9-10; cf. John 1:18). The title "Christ" (ⲠⲬ̅Ⲥ̅) (p. 36,4) occurs in connection with the fact that he makes it possible for the disturbed person to leave the state of confusion in which he finds himself and to return to the Father. The title "Jesus" (ⲒⲎ̅Ⲥ) (p. 20,11) also appears in apposition with the descriptive phrase "the compassionate, faithful (one)" (ⲠⲒϢⲀⲚϨⲎⲦ ⲠⲒⲠⲒⲤⲦⲞⲤ) (p. 20,10; cf. Rev. 19:11). It is in this context that the only direct reference to the suffering of Christ in the Gospel of Truth is found.

p. 20,3 This (Book) is
that which no one is able to take,
5 since (ἐπειδή) it is revealed for him who will
    take it and
be slain. No one
from those who believed
in salvation could appear until
that Book became accessible (lit. came into their midst).
10 For this reason the compassionate, faithful (one)
    (πιστός),
Jesus, showed mercy by taking the sufferings upon
    himself

> until he took that Book,
> since (ἐπειδή) he knew that his death
> 14 meant life for many.

This understanding of the sacrifice of Christ is presented in terms of the language of the Revelation of John where the opening of "the (heavenly) scroll" is accomplished by the sacrificial death of Christ on the cross as the central event in history (Rev. 5:2-4, 9, and 12; 13:8).[71] The obvious use of Biblical imagery, however, does not mean that the Gnostic writer has also adopted the thought behind the imagery. For this reason the interpretation of the meaning of the cross in the Gospel of Truth, must await a full consideration of the passion of Christ in connection with the Gnostic way of salvation. For the present it is sufficient to note that the full title "Jesus Christ (p. 18,16) and the shorter titles "Jesus" (p. 20,11; p. 24,8) or "Christ (p. 36,4) are used interchangeably for the *Logos*. This interchange reflects the influence of the Fourth Gospel where the title *Logos* (John 1:1 and 14) is quickly dropped in favor of "Jesus Christ" (John 1:17; 17:3; cf. John 20:31) and "Jesus" (about 240 times) or "Christ" (sixteen times). In the Gospel of John the title *Logos* is reserved exclusively for the pre-existence of Christ (John 1:1) and the announcement of his Incarnation (John 1:14); thereafter the title is consistently shifted to "Jesus Christ" and "Jesus" or "Christ." The fact that there is no Incarnation in the Gospel of Truth presumably leads the Gnostic writer to ignore this distinction and to use interchangeably throughout his homily either the title *Logos* or "Jesus Christ." Regardless of which name is given to the "Saviour" in the Gospel of Truth, the Gnostic author is consistent in interpreting his appearance as the revelation of the divine origin of man's existence in the Father. The conclusion which naturally follows is that the author of the Gospel of Truth has overlooked the important Johannine emphasis on the earthly life of the Logos in the form of human flesh and has limited his understanding to the Johannine teaching concerning the pre-existence of the Logos. Having accepted the eternal existence of the Logos with God, he expands this Johannine view to include his own understanding of the appearance of Christ as a heavenly messenger. On the one hand, the Logos exists in "the thought and mind of the Father" (p. 16,35-36) and emerges from the Father as an expression of the "depth of His thought" (p. 37,7-12; cf. John 1:1). On the other hand, he appears in a heavenly "body" (p. 26,8; cf. John 1:14) and "humbles himself unto death (p. 20,28-29; cf. Phil. 2:7). Although there is mention of "the cross" (ΠΕϹ⳨ΟϹ) (p. 20,27; cf. p. 18,24; p. 20,25), the emphasis is not on the suffering of Christ as a divine "redeemer" but on the communication of the knowledge of man's true existence in the Father as a divine "messenger." In spite of the reference to the Logos as the "Saviour" (σωτήρ) (p. 16,37), the only redemptive work which he performs is the revelation to man of his divine origin in the Father. Like John the Baptist, Jesus is only a messenger of the Father in the Gospel of Truth, and his mission is to reveal to man the "place" (τόπος) (p. 40,32) in the Father for which he has been destined. Therefore, it is not surprising that the true Gnostics are called "members" (μέλος) (p. 18,40; cf. p. 18,30-31) of the Father rather than of Christ.

---

[71] H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John, The Greek Text with Introductory Notes and Indices* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954), pp. 74-85, and R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John with Introduction, Notes, and Indices, also the Greek Text and English Translation* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1920), Vol. I, p. 134-153.

Since the discussion of Johannine ideas has been limited thus far to the Father-Son relationship and the θεός - λόγος relationship, it is appropriate to continue the investigation with a consideration of the

Spirit. A discussion of the Johannine doctrine will provide the basis for a comparison with the thought of the Gospel of Truth.

IV. THE SPIRIT (τὸ πνεῦμα)

John lays greater stress than any of the other Evangelists upon the work of the Spirit. The term πνεῦμα occurs twenty-two times in the Fourth Gospel and is used in a variety of ways.[72] It occurs in the original sense of "wind" (John 3:8). Nevertheless, the fact that the wind is intangible and uncontrollable makes it a vivid illustration for the Spirit of God. It also appears in association with "water" (ὕδωρ) as a symbol of physical birth (John 3:5) and as a symbol of life in the Spirit (John 7:38-39), in association with "truth" (ἀλήθεια) as the object of worship (John 4:23-24) and as the nature of the Spirit (John 14:17; 15:26; 16:13), and in association with "life" (ζωή) as the gift of the Spirit (John 6:63). The basis of comparison with the Gospel of Truth, however, occurs with respect to the metaphysical, the psychological, and the mediatorial usages which contain the crux of the Johannine idea of "the Spirit."

(1) The Metaphysical Usage. The term "spirit" occurs six times in a metaphysical context with reference to the divine nature (John 3:6; 4:23-24; 6:63). The definition of the nature of God as "spirit" (πνεῦμα

---

[72] E. Schweizer, "Spirit of God" in *Bible Key Words*, Vol. III, Part 2 (1960), pp. 24-108, esp. 88-97. Cf. M. Goguel, *La notion johannique de l'Esprit et ses antécédents historiques* (Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1902); H. B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament: A Study of Primitive Christian Teaching* (London: Macmilland and Co., 1910), pp. 129-168; H. Windisch, "Jesus und der Geist im Johannes-Evangelium" in J. R. Harris's *Festschrift* (1933), S. 303-318; C. K. Barrett, "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel," *J. T. S.*, n.s. 1 (1950), 1-15; E. Schweizer, "The Spirit of Power: The Uniformity and Diversity of the Concept of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament," *Interpr.*, 6 (1952), 259-278; and C. H. Dodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 213-227.

ὁ θεός) (John 4:24) is the most conspicuous use of the term in this connection. The implication is that God the Father belongs to a higher sphere which is inaccessible to man and which is only made available to him in the Son who became flesh. Because of the Incarnation, man is enabled to have immediate communion with God, thereby making possible a worship "in spirit" (ἐν πνεύματι) with the one who is the "truth" (John 4:23-24). This ability of man to commune with God depends on his being born of the Spirit, and then it can be said that he belongs to the eternal realm of "spirit" (John 3:6). The gift of life is bestowed upon man as a result of his fellowship with the unseen eternal order of God which is "spirit," and this realm is contrasted with the seen temporal order which is "flesh" (John 6:63). The coming of God in Jesus Christ is the step which spans the dividing line between God and the world which is ruinous for man. Therefore, access to God is only to be found where God Himself encounters the world, i.e. in Jesus who brings man into a relationship with the eternal order of God through the gift of the Spirit.

The term πνεῦμα also has an important place in the Gospel of Truth where it occurs as the Coptic abbreviation ⲠⲚⲀ . In contrast to the Fourth Gospel it does not occur in a metaphysical sense since the Gnostic writer develops this phase of his thinking with reference to the Father. This is why he speaks of "the Father of Truth" (p. 16,33) instead of "the Spirit of Truth" (John 14:17; 15:26; 16:13). Instead of discussing the nature of God as "spirit" (John 4:24), the author of the Gospel of Truth sees the Being of God rooted in the "depth" (βάθος) of the "thought" (ⲘⲈⲈⲨⲈ) and the "mind" (νοῦς) of the Father (p. 37,8-10). His understanding of πνεῦμα takes its inspiration from the Fourth Gospel in connection with the psychological and mediatorial uses of the term.

(2) The Psychological Usage. The term "spirit" occurs three times in the Fourth Gospel in a psychological context with reference to human nature (John 11:33; 13:21; 19:30). It is significant that all three of these passages refer to Jesus. His emotion is aroused by the presence of moral evil which triumphed in the death of Lazarus - "he was deeply moved in spirit (τῷ πνεύματι) and troubled" (John 11:33) - and which was about to triumph in the betrayal of Judas - "he was troubled in spirit" (John 13:21). Here πνεῦμα is the seat of the religious emotions, the highest and innermost part of man's nature, whereas ψυχή is the seat of natural affections and desires (cf. John 12:27). The term "spirit" is also used in connection with the giving up of the human spirit of Jesus when his body dies on the cross - "he bowed his head and gave up his spirit" (τὸ πνεῦμα) (John 19:30), thereby proving that his death was voluntary and not the necessary result of exhaustion (cf. John 10:17-18). In this connection πνεῦμα stands along with ψυχή for the "breath-soul," that invisible factor in the human being which is inseparable from the function of breathing and without which man ceases to live.

The psychological use of the term πνεῦμα appears three times in the Gospel of Truth with reference to the human spirit of man (p. 34,11; p. 42,32-33; p. 43,17). The first passage is part of a long section dealing with the fragrance of the Father (p. 33,35 - p. 36,2; cf. 2 Cor. 2:14-16).

p. 34,9 For (γάρ) it is not the ears which
smell the fragrance, but (ἀλλά) ...
the spirit (πνεῦμα) which has
the (sense of) smelling, and it (= the spirit)
draws it (= the fragrance)
to itself and plunges down into
14 the fragrance of the Father.

The "fragrance" (ⲤⲦⲀⲈⲒ) of the Father is probably a metaphor for His divine essence which comes "from the grace of His countenance" (p. 34,2-3), whereas the "spirit" (ⲡ̄ⲛ̄ⲁ) is apparently the means by which man appropriates this divine essence for himself. It is also implied that the cessation of this process is the beginning of death (cf. John 19:30). The one occurrence of the noun "fragrance" (ὀσμή) in the Fourth Gospel pertains to the ointment of Mary and has no special significance (John 12:3). The related verb "to smell or give off an odor" (ὄζω), however, plays an important part in heightening the miracle of the resurrection of Lazarus from the dead. Martha says, "Lord, *by this time the odor will be offensive* (ἤδη ὄζει), for he (= Lazarus) has been dead four days" (John 11:39). From John's point of view the stench of death is more than a matter of sense perception which detects the process of putrefaction in the human body; it is meant to bring out the horror of the very essence of death. The Johannine ambiguity in this twofold usage leaves the door open to the author of the Gospel of Truth who is much more interested in the essence of things than in their appearance. This explains why he gives more emphasis to the reception of the divine essence of the Father (= His fragrance) by the spirit of man than to the appearance of the *Logos* in his earthly life. Instead, the omnipresence of the *Logos* in the world guarantees that the fragrance of the Father will be made known everywhere.

The other two references to the psychological use of the term πνεῦμα in the Gospel of Truth appear in connection with the heavenly rest in the *Pleroma*. Those who enter "the place of the blessed" will find rest by being refreshed "in the spirit" (ϩⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲡⲛ̄ⲁ)(p. 42, 32-33) with the result for each man that "*his spirit* (ⲡⲉϥⲡⲛ̄ⲁ) rejoices in Him (= the Father) and glorifies Him in whom he was (and still is)" (qualitative ϣⲟⲟⲡ) (p. 43,17-18). The term "spirit" in this context refers to man's inner self (= his spiritual seed) which finds perfect rest with the Father in heaven (cf. I John 3:9). In other words, only those who have the "spirit" are redeemable. This implies a one-sided doctrine of predestination which is foreign to the thought of the Fourth Gospel. Instead of leaving any of the initiative for salvation up to man, the Gospel of Truth teaches that the mere possession of the "spirit" or "the spiritual seed" is the basis of redemption by the Father. This enables the spiritual man to ascend "in the spirit" to the place of heavenly rest where "his spirit" realizes its true existence in the Father (p. 42,32-33; p. 43,17). The distinctive Gnostic emphasis in the Gospel of Truth with respect to the predestination of the true Gnostic is not compatible with the Johannine emphasis on "whoever (πᾶς ὁ) believes" (John 3:15 and 16; 6:40; 11:26; 12:46) and "all (πάντες) will believe" (John 11:48; cf. John 1:7 and 16; 5:23; 17:21). It is striking that John avoids the pitfall of discussing the human spirit of man and limits the psychological usage of πνεῦμα to the human spirit of Jesus.

(3) The Mediatorial Usage. The distinctive Johannine contribution is the use of the term "Spirit" twelve times with reference to the mediation of the presence of Christ, of which nine appear simply as "the Spirit" (τὸ πνεῦμα) (John 1:32; 3:5-6 and 34; 7:39; 14:17; 15:26; 16:13) and three appear as "the Holy Spirit" (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον) (John 1:33; 14:26; 20:22). This usage also includes four occurrences of Paraclete (παράκλητος) in the sense of "Comforter" or "Counselor" (John 14:16 and 26; 15:26; 16:7; cf. 1 John 2:1), a term which is uniquely Johannine and which is clearly identified with "the Spirit of Truth" (τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας) (John 14:17; 15:26; 16:13; cf. 1 John 2:27; 5:7) and "the Holy Spirit" (John 14:26). The main emphasis in the Fourth Gospel is on Christ as the bearer and bestower of

the Spirit whose purpose is the mediation of the presence of Christ in the Church after his departure from earth. John makes it clear that "the Spirit" (τὸ πνεῦμα) is the unique possession of Jesus during his earthly ministry, having descended upon him at his baptism as a proof of his divine Sonship (John 1:32). Moreover, Jesus has not received the Spirit "by measure" (ἐκ μέτρου), i.e. the Father has endowed His Son with completeness of spiritual insight and power (John 3:34). It is promised that those who believe in him will receive the Spirit but only after he has been glorified (John 7:39; cf. John 16:7). In other words, the necessary limitations of Christ's historical presence with the disciples temporarily excludes the realization of his abiding presence, whereas the full realization of the abiding presence of Christ is possible only after the resurrection and is the necessary condition for sending the disciples into the world. The gift of the Spirit after the resurrection is expressed in terms that are reminiscent of man's creation in the beginning when it is said that "*he* (= Jesus) *breathed* *on* *them* (ἐνεφύσησεν) and said to them, 'Receive (*the*) *Holy* *Spirit'* (πνεῦμα ἅγιον)" (John 20:22; cf. Gen. 2:7). Receiving the Holy Spirit is expressed elsewhere as being born "of Spirit" (ἐκ πνεύματος) and being born "from above" (ἄνωθεν), thereby enabling man to rise from the sphere of flesh on earth to the eternal order of God in heaven (John 3:5; 3:3 and 7). This concept of rebirth makes sense only in the light of the Incarnation of Christ, i.e. the descent of the *Logos* to the sphere of human flesh which reaches its climax in death (the characteristic mark of σάρξ), and it is available only after the resurrection of Christ, i.e. the ascent of the *Logos* to the eternal sphere of God with the result that the Spirit is sent from the Father to the Church. In the Fourth Gospel the sequel to the earthly life of Jesus is his return to the glory which he had enjoyed before the creation of the world (John 17:5). This heavenly event has its earthly counterpart in the sending of the Spirit from the Father as a continual re-presentation of Christ on earth. Thus, the unity of the Father and the Son is made complete by the sending of the Spirit.

Special mention should be made of the five *Paraclete*-Sayings in which the mediatorial usage appears in its most developed form.[73] (a) John 14:16-17 sets forth the identity of Jesus and the Spirit. The Spirit is referred to as "another Comforter" (ἄλλον παράκλητον) in addition to Christ. In fact, the work of Christ is described in exactly the same way as that of the Spirit with respect to teaching (John 7:14; 14:26), bearing witness (John 8:14; 15:26), convicting the world of sin (John 3:18-20; 16:8-11), and speaking on their own authority (John 14:10; 16:13). Jesus had been with the disciples in his historical presence, but now that he is going away he promises to send them another Comforter or Counselor. In contrast to the brief span of the earthly ministry of Jesus, the Spirit will be with the disciples "forever" (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα). In this Saying he is called "the Spirit of Truth," i.e. the one who knows what is real and permanent in contrast to what is false and transient. (b) John 14:25-26 sets forth the continuity of the work of the Spirit with the ministry of Jesus. The Comforter will be sent by the Father in the name of Christ. His work is described as teaching (διδάξει) the disciples all things and recalling to their memory (ὑπομνήσει) all the sayings of Jesus. In this passage he is called "the Holy Spirit." (c) John 15:26-27 brings the Comforter into the closest possible relationship with the Father and the Son. The Father is to send out (πεμψει) the Comforter. Therefore, it is said that he proceeds from (ἐκπορεύεται) the Father. His work is described as bearing witness (μαρτυρήσει) to Christ, i.e. making the full significance of the Incarnation clear to every generation of believers. (d) John 16:7-11 sets forth the impossibility of a concurrent ministry for the two Comforters. It is specifically said that the (second) *Paraclete* will not come until Christ (the first *Paraclete*) has departed. His work is described as convicting (ἐλέξει) the world with respect to sin, righteousness, and judgment. Sin is failure to believe; righteousness is Christ's redeeming work; and judgment is Christ's complete victory on the cross over "the prince of this world" (John 12:31). (e) John 16:12-15 again sets forth the identity of Jesus and the Spirit. Although the term παράκλητος is not used, this Saying is clearly related to the other four because of the use of "the Spirit of Truth" which has already been identified as the *Paraclete* (cf. John 14:17; 15:26). His work is described as guiding (ὁδηγήσει) the disciples into all truth, as making known (ἀναγγελεῖ) to them the things that are about to happen, and as glorifying (δοξάσει) Christ. Taken as a whole, these five *Paraclete*-Sayings present the promise of Christ that the Spirit will come after his departure from earth in order to continually mediate his presence to the disciples. Although the Spirit already rests on Jesus during his ministry (John 1:32; 3:34), the true mediation of his presence will only be possible after his death and resurrection (John 7:39). The constant use of the future tense for the work of the Spirit in these Sayings also points in the same direction. Thus, the Holy Spirit becomes the power in the Church which makes it possible for man to recognize Jesus as the Saviour and to find in him "the way, the truth, and the life" (John 14:6).

---

[73] E. Schweizer, "Spirit of God" in *Bible Key Words*, pp. 95-97. Cf. B. W. Bacon, "The 'Other' Comforter," *Exp.*, 14 (1917), 274-282; H. Sasse, "Der Paraklet im Johannesevangelium," *Z. N. T. W.*, 24 (1925), 260-277; H. Windisch, "Die fünf johanneischen Parakletssprüche" in A. Jülicher's *Festschrift* (1927), S. 110-137; G. Bornkamm, "Der Paraklete im Johannesevangelium" in R. Bultmann's *Festschrift* I (1949), S. 12-35; and W. F. Howard, *op. cit.*, pp. 71-80.

The mediatorial use of the term πνεῦμα occurs five times in the Gospel of Truth, of which three refer to "the Holy Spirit" (p. 24,11; p. 26,36; p. 27,4), one refers simply to "the Spirit" (p. 30,17), and one refers to "the Spirit of power" (p. 31,18). The last expression emphasizes the vital source of energy which the Spirit gives to man (cf. 2 Tim. 1:7; Acts 1:8). The specific Johannine terminology is reflected in the use of "the Holy Spirit" (ⲠⲠ̄Ⲛ̄Ⲁ̄ ⲈⲦⲞⲨⲀⲀⲂ) and "the Spirit" in the Gospel of Truth. The four occurrences of these two expressions provide the core of the idea of "the Spirit" in the Gnostic treatise.

In the first passage the unitarian view of God is upheld by placing the Holy Spirit in the closest possible relationship to the Father.

p. 24,6 He (= the *Logos*) purifies it (= the All) and
causes it to return
to the Father and to the Mother[74] -
Jesus (= subject) - through (?) the boundlessness of
his kindness (lit. sweetness). The Father opens
His bosom,
and (ⲆⲈ) His bosom
11 is *the Holy Spirit* (ⲠⲠ̄Ⲛ̄Ⲁ̄ ⲈⲦⲞⲨⲀⲀⲂ).

The reference to the existence of the Holy Spirit in the "bosom" (ⲦⲀⲠ) of the Father denotes the closest possible communion and implies a timeless existence of intimate fellowship (p. 24,9-10). In the Fourth Gospel it is the Son who exists in "the bosom of the Father" (τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός) (John 1:18; cf. 17:5). The Gospel of Truth expresses the sending of the Spirit by the assertion that "the Father opens His bosom" (ⲉϥϭⲱⲗⲡ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥⲧⲁⲡ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲡⲓⲱⲧ) (p. 24,9). In the Fourth Gospel Jesus refers to the Holy Spirit as the one "whom the Father will send in my name" (ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου) (John 14:26; cf. 15:26). Thus, the Gospel of Truth presents the Holy Spirit as existing in eternal relation to the Father and coming from the Father, whereas the Gospel of John limits this eternal relation to the existence of the Son with the Father and accounts for the coming of the Spirit through the instrumentality of the Son. The prominent place which John gives to Christ is shifted in the Gnostic writing to the Spirit. In so doing, the author of the Gospel of Truth obscures the Johannine distinction between Father, Son, and Spirit and absorbs the existence of the Spirit into his unitarian view of God.

---

[74] It is somewhat surprising that the Holy Spirit is called "the Mother" (ϮⲘⲈⲈⲨ). This is the only use of the expression in the entire document and need not be erased by taking ⲘⲈⲈⲨ as the alternate A^2 spelling of ⲘⲈⲈⲨⲈ which means "thought" (cf. K. Grobel, *op. cit.*, pp. 91-92). Instead, the passage can be explained as an early allusion to the principle of generation by male and fenale Aeons. This is expressed grammatically by the masculine article Ⲡ with "Father" and the feminine article Ⲧ with "Mother." If the Gospel of Truth is an early work of Valentinus himself, then it is quite possible that his disciples developed this nascent idea into the fully developed system of male and female Aeons in the *Pleroma* called "syzygies" (from the Greek noun συζυγία which means "pair"). Cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I, 18,2; V, 31,1.

Having established the eternal relation of the Spirit with the Father, the next two usages proceed to describe the sending of the Spirit by the Father and the reception of the Spirit by man.

p. 26,33 For (γάρ) everyone (who has the capacity for knowledge) loves truth
because truth is (the) mouth
35 of the Father. His tongue is the
Holy Spirit (ⲡⲓⲡⲛ̄ⲁ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ) who joins
p. 27,1 him (= everyone who loves truth) to truth (and) attaches
him by his tongue to (the) mouth of the Father,
when (= at which time) he should
4 receive the Holy Spirit (ⲡⲓⲡⲛ̄ⲁ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ).

The reference to the Holy Spirit as the "tongue" (ⲗⲉⲥ) of the Father expresses the way in which the Father chooses to communicate his truth (= His mouth), i.e. through the organ which makes possible the power of communication (= his tongue). In other words, the sending of the Holy Spirit is the way in which the Father communicates his "truth" (ⲦⲘⲚ̄Ⲧ-ⲘⲎⲈ) to man. In the Fourth Gospel Jesus promises that the Spirit will be sent from the Father in order to guide the believer into "all the truth" (τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν) (John 16:13; cf. John 14:6), i.e. into all aspects of the absolute Truth which is Jesus Christ. Thus, the Gospel of Truth presents the function of the Spirit as making known to man the truth about the origin and goal of his existence in the Father, whereas the Gospel of John presents the work of the Spirit as making known to man the absolute Truth which has been unveiled in the life of Jesus Christ. The prominent place which John gives to Christ is again shifted to the Spirit in the Gospel of Truth. The main emphasis in the Gnostic treatise is the return of man to his true existence in the Father. This is made possible when the Holy Spirit (= the Father's tongue) attaches man to truth (= the Father's mouth) (p. 26,35 - p. 27,2). It takes place at the time when man acknowledges the Father's call and discovers the true origin of his existence in the Father, i.e. "when he should receive the Holy Spirit" (ⲈϤⲀϪⲒ Ⲙ̄ⲠⲒⲠ̄Ⲛ̄Ⲁ ⲈⲦⲞⲨⲀⲀⲂ) (p. 27,3-4). In the Fourth Gospel the promise of Jesus to send the Spirit is fulfilled when the Risen Christ commands the disciples by saying, "Receive (the) Holy Spirit" (λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον) (John 20:22), i.e. receive the presence of the new life which can now be communicated to you as a result of my glorification (= crucifixion and resurrection). It is quite noticeable that the Gospel of Truth uses this Johannine phrase apart from its specific Sitz im Leben. Instead of connecting it with a post-resurrection appearance of Christ, the Gnostic writer prefers to relate it to the fact that the receiving of the Spirit is the way in which man is guided into all the truth - not about

Christ but about the Father (John 16:13; cf. 8:32). Although the superficial similarity of language between the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth is extremely close, the significant difference of thought must not be overlooked. The Gospel of Truth sees the function of the Holy Spirit as giving man the power to arouse out of the sleep of ignorance and to attain the self-realization of his true existence in the Father, whereas the Fourth Gospel understands the Holy Spirit as the means by which the new life in Christ is communicated to man. In the first instance the Spirit enables man to return to the realm of the Father; in the second the Spirit enables man to receive the gift of Christ.

The teaching concerning the work of the Spirit is elaborated upon in considerable detail in the final passage in which the name appears only as πνεῦμα .

p. 30,12 Blessed is (lit. And it is a good thing for)
the man who thus discovers (lit. comes to) himself
and awakens, and blessed (μακάριος)
15 is He (= the Father) who has opened
the eyes of the blind. And
the Spirit (ⲡⲓⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅) came to him quickly
in order
to raise him up. When he (= Jesus) had extended his hand
20 to the one who was stretched out on the
ground, he (= the Spirit) caused him to stand
on his feet, for he (= the one who is asleep in ignorance)
had indeed (δέ) not yet stood up.
He (= the Spirit) made accessible (lit. gave the means
of knowing) to them (= the Gnostics)
25 the knowledge from the Father and the
revelation of His Son.
For (γάρ) when they had seen him (= Jesus) and
had heard him, he (= the Spirit) permitted (lit. gave) them
to take a taste of him (= Jesus) and
30 to smell him and
to touch the beloved Son.
When he had appeared
to teach them concerning the
illimitable Father, when he had breathed into them
35 that which is in the thought (of the Father) while
doing His will, when many had received
37 the light, they turned to Him (= the Father).

It now becomes clear that the Spirit gives man the power to awaken out of the sleep of ignorance (p. 30,6-19) by making available to him "the knowledge from the Father and the revelation of His Son" (ⲠⲒⲤⲀⲨⲚⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲘ̄ ⲠⲒⲰⲦ ⲞⲨⲀϨⲀ ⲠⲞⲨⲰⲚϨ̄ ⲀⲂⲀⲖ Ⲙ̄ⲠⲈϤϢⲎⲢⲈ) (p. 30,25-26). This truth which the Spirit communicates to man enables him to discover the divine origin of his existence and thereby to return to the Father. Moreover, the fact that the Spirit enables man to interpret correctly the meaning of the appearance of Jesus is expressed metaphorically as allowing man to "taste" (ϮⲠⲈ), "smell" (ϢⲀⲖⲘ̄), and "touch" (ⲈⲘⲀϨⲦⲈ) the beloved Son (p. 30,29-31). This passage is obviously inspired by the analogous Johannine language in which the senses of "hearing" (ὃ ἀκηκόαμεν), "seeing" (ὃ ἑωρακάμεν), and "touching" (ἐψηλάφησαν) testify to the reality and concreteness of the Incarnation (1 John 1:1-3). John intends for the object of this sense perception to be the Incarnate presence of the *Logos*, not the abstract idea of the eternal *Logos*. The ambiguity of the passage, however, presents an opportunity for the Gnostic writer to inject his own interpretation, thereby shifting the emphasis from the historical reality of Christ to the abstract idea of the omnipresence of the eternal *Logos*. By separating the essence of the *Logos* from his earthly appearance, the Gnostic is able to taste, smell, and touch true reality. The influence of John can also be detected in the statement that "*he* (= Jesus) *breathed into them* (ⲈⲀϤⲚⲒϤⲈ ⲚϨⲎⲦⲞⲨ) that which is in the thought (of the Father)" (p. 30,34-35). In the Fourth Gospel it is said that "he breathed on them" (ἐνεφύσησεν) in connection with his transmitting the power of the Holy Spirit to the disciples (John 20:22; cf. Gen. 2:7). The fact that Christ only breathes into men that which is in the "thought"

(ⲘⲈⲈⲨⲈ) of the Father (p. 30,35) points back to the work of the Spirit as the opening up of the "bosom" (ⲦⲀⲠ) of the Father (p. 24,9-11). Whereas the work of Christ is to make known to man the nature of his true existence in the Father, the function of the Spirit is to give man the power to realize his true existence in God Himself. Therefore, the Holy Spirit in the Gospel of Truth is closely associated with the Father and, along with Christ, is the means by which the Father awakens man from the sleep of ignorance and calls him to Himself.

The way in which the author of the Gospel of Truth uses certain aspects of the Johannine teaching concerning the Spirit clearly reveals his own peculiar interest. By discussing the metaphysical usage in connection with the nature of the Father, he shows his interest in cosmology. By restricting the psychological use of the term to man, he shows his interest in anthropology. By reinterpreting the Johannine concept of the Spirit as the gift of Christ to man, the Gospel of Truth presents the mediatorial usage as the means by which man returns to the Father. The result is an exchange of the Johannine trinitarian view of God as Father, Son, and Spirit for the Gnostic unitarian view of God.

The relationship between the Father and the Son in the Fourth Gospel is closely associated with the giving of the Father's name to the Son. The comparison of the leading ideas of the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth will be continued with a discussion of "the name."

V. THE NAME (τὸ ὄνομα)

The Johannine idea of "the name" has an important bearing upon the revelation of God and the salvation of man. The term ὄνομα occurs twenty-five times in the Fourth Gospel in a variety of usages.[75] It appears three times as a proper name with reference to the Baptist (John 1:6), Nicodemus (John 3:1), and Malchus (John 18:10). It occurs in the phrase "by name" (κατ' ὄνομα) with reference to the Good Shepherd's knowledge of his sheep (John 10:3), and it appears in the Old Testament quotation - "Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord" (John 12:13; cf. Psalm 118:26). The influence of the Fourth Gospel on the Gospel of Truth, however, comes to the surface in the usages pertaining to the revelation of the name of the Father by the Son and the response of man in accepting or rejecting the name of Christ.

(1) The Revelation of the Father. The term ὄνομα appears seven times in the Fourth Gospel with reference to the revelation of the name of the Father by the Son, five of which use the phrase "Thy name" (τὸ ὄνομά σου) (John 12:28; 17:6, 11-12, and 26) and two of which occur as "my Father's name" (τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρός μου) (John 5:43; 10:25). This use of "the Name" with reference to the divine manifestation of God to man has its background in the Old Testament concept

---

[75] H. Bietenhard, ὄνομα in G. Kittel's *T. W. N. T.*, 5 (1954), 242-283, insbes. 269-283. Cf. G. A. Chadwick, "Asking In Christ's Name," *Exp.*, 3 (1887), 191-198; A. J. H. W. Brandt, " Ὄνομα en de Doopsformule in het Nieuwe Testament," *Th. Tijd.*, 25 (1891), 565-610; W. Heitmüller, "Im Namen Jesu": *Eine sprachliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament, speziell zur altchristlichen Taufe* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1903); B. Jacob, *Im Namen Gottes: Eine sprachliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Alten und Neuen Testament* (Berlin: S. Calvary, 1903); R. Hirzel, *Der Name: Ein Beitrag zu seiner Geschichte im Altertum und besonders bei den Griechen* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1918); O. Merlier, " Ὄνομα et ἐν ὀνόματι dans le quatrième Évangile," *Rev. Et. Gr.*, 47 (1934), 180-204; and C. H. Dodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 93-96.

of שֵׁם (Psalm 20:1; Prov. 18:10; Isaiah 18:7). The Jewish understanding of "the Name of God" is much more than a means of identification; it is a symbol of the personality which lies behind it. In the latter sense it has a relational character in which the emphasis is placed on the significance which the name has for man. In the Fourth Gospel the name of God is the perfect expression for men of the true nature of the Father which is revealed in the life and work of His Son, Jesus Christ. The Johannine teaching receives its fullest treatment in the "high priestly prayer" of Christ.

> I have manifested Thy name to the men whom Thou gavest me out of the world. ... Holy Father, keep them in Thy name which thou hast given me, that they may be one, even as we are one. While I was with them, I kept them in Thy name which Thou hast given me. ... I made known to them Thy name, and I will make it known, that the love with which Thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them (John 17:6, 11-12, and 26).

These passages suggest that the "giving of the Father's name" to Christ expresses the fulness of His commission to reveal God to men. It is because Christ has "made known" the Father's name that God becomes accessible to man (cf. John 15:15). It is true that the Son is sent by the Father and that his ministry is accomplished "in the name of the Father" as His delegate and representative (John 5:43; 10:25), but the important thing is that God's essential nature as Father is revealed to man in the Incarnate Son. In fact, Jesus understands his entire mission as "manifesting" (ἐφανέρωσα) and "making known" (ἐγνώρισα) the name of the Father (John 17:6 and 26). This is much more than making known to man the fact that God exists; it is the establishment of a relationship in which God becomes "our Father." Therefore, he desires to guard his disciples by keeping them "in his Father's name," i.e. in the sphere of the love and protection of his heavenly Father

(John 17:11-12). This is not just a matter of "words" since the "works" which he performs in his Father's name also "bear witness" (μαρτυρεῖ) to Him, i.e. they reveal the saving work of the Father in the life of His Son (John 10:25). Jesus anticipates the fulfilment of his mission when he utters a prayer of submission to what was impending: "Father, glorify Thy name" (Πάτερ, δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα), i.e. make Thy true character glorious even in my suffering and death (John 12:28a). The request of Jesus is followed by the answer of God: "I have both glorified it and will glorify it again" (John 12:28b). This means that God has already revealed His name as the loving Father in the life and work of Jesus and will reveal His name again in the death and resurrection of Jesus. Thus, the name of God in the sense of His true character can be known only in the concrete manifestation of Himself in Jesus Christ.

The term ὄνομα also has a prominent place in the Gospel of Truth where it appears as the Coptic noun ⲣⲉⲛ. The term is used twice in a general way as a proper name with reference to the salvation which the "Saviour" (σωτήρ) brings (p. 16,38) and the gospel or "good news" which results from it (p. 17,1). The specific usage which reflects the influence of the Fourth Gospel, however, pertains to the revelation of the name of the Father by the Son. Of the thirty-three occurrences of the term in this way, five appear as "the name of the Father" (ⲡⲣⲉⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲱⲧ) (p. 38,6-7, 22, 30, and 37; p. 39,25-26), nine as "His name" (ⲡⲉϥⲣⲉⲛ) (p. 38,6, 11, and 32; p. 39,5 and 20; p. 40,22 and 24; p. 41,2; p. 43,21), nine as "the name" (ⲡⲣⲉⲛ) (p. 22,12; p. 38,14, 16, 24, and 27; p. 39,24; p. 40,5, 7, and 9), two as "this name" (ⲡⲓⲣⲉⲛ) (p. 39,3; p. 40,26), two as "this great name" (ⲡⲓⲛⲁϭ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲛ) (p. 38,26; p. 39,27), two as "the true name" (ⲡⲣⲉⲛ ⲙⲁⲙⲏⲉ)

(p. 39,1; p. 40,5-6), two as "the name Lord" (ⲛ̄ϫⲁⲉⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲛ) (p. 40,8-9 and 14), and two as "a name" (ⲟⲩⲣⲉⲛ) (p. 38,25 and 34). Just as the Johannine usage is found largely in the "high priestly prayer" of Jesus, the Gospel of Truth also presents this aspect of its thought in a highly concentrated form in one extended passage (p. 38,7 - p. 41,3). This section is one of the few places in the Gnostic writing where the author confines his attention to a single theme and develops it systematically.

p. 38,7 And (δέ) *the name of the Father* is the Son. It is
He (= the Father)
who in the beginning named the one who
came forth from Him, since he (= the Son) is (the) same
10 (with the Father) and (since) He (= the Father)
begot him as a
Son. The Father gave him *His name* which
He had because it is He who possesses
all things since they exist with
14 Him.

In the Fourth Gospel God gives His name to Jesus (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι) as an expression of the fact that he not only exists but that he desires to become related to man as "Father" (John 17:11-12). The dependence upon John is unmistakeable when the Gospel of Truth says that "the Father has given him (= the Son) His name" (ⲁⲩϯ ⲡⲉϥⲣⲉⲛ ⲁⲣⲁϥ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲡⲓⲱⲧ) (p. 38,11). The Gnostic writer, however, takes advantage of the Johannine ambiguity and emphasizes only the aspect of God's existence. The relational character of the Father and man is overlooked in favor of the eternal existence of the *Logos* with God. The Father is depicted as naming the one who came forth from him "in the beginning" (ⲛ̄ϣⲁⲣⲡ̄) since the Son is the "same" (ⲣⲱ) with Him (p. 38,8-9). In the Johannine Prologue it is stated that the *Logos* was "in the beginning" (ἐν ἀρχῇ) "with" (πρός) God (John 1:1-2). Furthermore, the Son came forth from the Father since "He

(= the Father) begot him as a Son" (ⲁϥⲙⲉⲥⲧϥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩϣⲏⲣⲉ) (p. 37,10-11). In the Fourth Gospel it is said that the *Logos* "became flesh (σάρξ ἐγένετο) and dwelt among us... as of the only (Son) (ὡς μονογενοῦς) from the Father" (John 1:14). The Gospel of Truth accounts for this act of "begetting" by the fact that it is the Father who possesses "all things" (ⲛⲕⲉⲉⲓ ⲛⲓⲙ) since they exist with Him (p. 38,12-14). John simply says that "all things" (πάντα) were made through Him (John 1:3). The use of Johannine vocabulary is indisputable. John, however, teaches that the *Logos* who is identical with God is also distinct from Him since He came out from Him in the act of the Incarnation. This distinction is lost sight of in the Gospel of Truth where the act of "begetting" is merely the expression of the thought and mind of the Father.

The Gospel of Truth further develops this aspect of Johannine thought by contrasting the invisible name with the visible Son and the inability to pronounce the name with the revelation of the name in the Son.

p. 38,14 He has *the name*;
He has *the Son*. One is able
to see him (= the Son), but (δέ) *the name*
is invisible, for
it alone is the
mystery (μυστήριον) of the Invisible One
20 which has come to ears that are
all full of Him (= to senses that are receptive
to Him). For (καὶ γάρ)
one does not speak *the name of the Father*,
but (δέ) it is revealed in a
24 Son. Therefore, *the name* is thus great.

The Father originally had both the name and the Son with Him in a pre-existent form, but as long as this situation prevailed, no one was able to see the name or the Son. Since His divine essence is itself something that cannot be seen, He chooses to make it visible in the life of His Son. In this way "the mystery of the Invisible One" (ⲙ̄ⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ

Ⲙ̄ⲠⲒⲀⲦⲚⲈⲨ) is unveiled and made known (p. 38,19). Whereas the name of the Father could not have been pronounced in the abstract form of His divine essence, it becomes concrete and visible in the appearance of His Son. The same teaching occurs in the Fourth Gospel in slightly different words: "No one has ever seen God (θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε); the only Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known" (John 1:18, cf. 6:46; 14:9). John, however, teaches that the Son has a human nature as the Incarnate *Logos*, while the Gospel of Truth views the Son only as a projection into the world of the divine essence of the Father.

The uniqueness and transcendence of the original act of naming is then discussed in a passage which reiterates the previous emphasis on the invisible nature of the name when it was with the Father.

p. 38,32 Since (ἐπειδή)
the Father is unbegotten, it is He alone who
has created him (= the Son) for Himself as a name,
35 before He had produced the Aeons (αἰών),
in order that the name of the Father
might rule over them as
Lord, that is, the
p. 39,1 true name which stands firm by His
command (and) by (His) perfect power.
For this name is not one
of (mere) words (λέξις) and
5 His name is not appelations,
but (ἀλλά) it is invisible.
He (= the Father) alone named him
because He alone sees it (= the name),
since He alone is the One who is
10 able to name him (= the Son).

Not only did this act of naming take place "in the beginning" but also "before He had produced the Aeons" (p. 38,8 and 35). This implies that the revelation of the Father is unique and final since the Father's name was never intended for anyone else except the Son (p. 40,14-15). The transcendence of the name is indicated by the fact that it does not consist of mere "words"

(λέξις) nor is it associated with "appelations" (ϨⲚ ⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲦⲀⲈⲒⲢⲈⲚ) (p. 39,4-5). Instead, the name is a designation for the divine essence of God. The original transcendence of the name with the Father is then communicated to man by means of its immanence in the Son.

p. 39,19 The Son
is His name. Moreover, He (= the Father)
has not hidden it in the thing (named),
but (ἀλλά) it was existing (there).
He alone has named the Son.
Therefore, the name belongs to the Father
25 just as the name of
the Father is the Son, the compassionate (one).
For (ἐπεί) where does one have a great name
apart from the Father? But, (ἀλλά)
someone will certainly (πάντως) say
30 to his friend: "Who
will ever name the one who
was existing before him,
as if (ὡς) indeed his offspring do not normally
receive their name
p. 40,1 from those
who begot them?"
Thus, it is fitting for us first
to understand (νοεῖν) this matter, that is, what
5 is the name? (Why?) Because his (= the Son's)
is the true name.
His (name) is not then
the name (sent forth from the Father (i.e. it
did not actually leave the Father when He
gave it to the Son), for
his is that (name) which exists, (the) name Lord.
Therefore, he did not receive the name
10 as a loan like
others according to (κατά) the manner
in which each one
is supplied with it (= the name). This (name)
is rather (δέ) the Lord's name. There is
15 none other to whom he has given it (= the name),
but (ἀλλά) it (= the name) remains unnamable
(and) unutterable
until the time when he who alone
is perfect (= the Son) uttered it,
20 and he (alone) is the one who
is able to pronounce
22 his name and to see it.

By saying that "the Son is His name" (ⲠϢⲎⲢⲈ ⲠⲈ ⲠⲈϤⲢⲈⲚ) (p. 39,19-20) or that "the name of the Father is the Son" (ⲠⲢⲈⲚ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲱⲧ ⲡⲉ ⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ) (p. 39,25-26), the Gnostic writer means that God becomes articulate in the world through the Son. Having already learned that the name of the Father has rule over the Aeons as "Lord" (ϫⲁⲉⲓⲥ) (p. 38,32-38), it is not surprising that the Son is also identified with "the name Lord" (ⲛ̄ϫⲁⲉⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲛ) (p. 40,8 and 14).[76] In agreement with the Fourth Gospel the idea of "the Name" is thus used to manifest the essential unity of the Father and the Son, asserting that the name of the Father is known only as it is revealed in the life of His Son. The one-sided emphasis of the Gospel of Truth, however, loses sight of the earthly life of the Son which is basic to the theology of John.

The concept of the "name" in the Gospel of Truth is further developed in the light of the Johannine teaching concerning the glorifying of the name of the Father by the Son.

p. 40,23 When He (= the Father) has thus decided (?)
that His name
25 should be His Son whom he desires (= His beloved Son) and
when he had given the name to
the one who had come forth from the Depth (βάθος),[77]
he (= the Son) spoke about His (= the Father's)
hidden things, while knowing
that the Father is good (lit. guileless).

---

[76] The Coptic phrase ⲛ̄ϫⲁⲉⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲛ is somewhat confusing because of the word order and the use of the particle ⲛ̄ . It seems most consistent with the context to reverse the word order and to interpret the ⲛ̄ in the sense of an appositive genitive, making the phrase the equivalent of τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου (cf. John 13:13; 20:28). Cf. Walter C. Till, *Koptische Grammatik (Saïdischer Dialect) mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnissen* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1955), S. 66-67.

[77] The Gospel of Truth supplements the Johannine teaching with its own distinctive cosmology with reference to the Son having come forth from the "Depth" (p. 40,27; cf. p. 22,25; p. 35,15; p. 37,7-8). Just as the term "invisible" (ⲁⲧⲛⲉⲩ) is used as an attribute of God whose true character cannot be seen apart from Christ (p. 38,19), the term "depth" (βάθος) is used as an attribute of God whose thought is unfathomable by man. In this context the term *Bathos* contains no suggestion of independence as in the case when it is used for the highest Aeon of the *Pleroma* in the later system of the disciples of Ptolemy (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I,1,1; I,11,1, *et passim*).

30 For this reason He (= the Father) indeed brought
this one (= the Son)
forth, in order that he might speak
about the place (τόπος) and (about) His (= the Father's)
Resting-Place from which he (= the Son) had come forth
p. 41,1 and in order that he might glorify the Pleroma
(πλήρωμα),
the greatness of His (= the Father's) name, and
3 the kindness (lit. sweetness) of the Father.

The term πλήρωμα is not used in the later Gnostic sense as "the totality of the thirty Aeons" but in the Biblical sense as "the fulness of the Godhead" (John 1:16; cf. Col. 1:19; 2:9). When interpreted in this way, the purpose clause "in order that he might glorify (ⲚϤϮⲈⲀⲨ) has three equally balanced objects: "the fulness (of the Godhead)," "the greatness of His name" (ϮⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲚⲀϬ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲠⲈϤⲢⲈⲚ), and "the kindness of the Father." When the purpose clause is seen in relation to the second object, the influence of the Gospel of John is clearly discernable. Jesus prays, "Father, glorify Thy name" (Πάτερ, δόξασόν σου το ὄνομα), implying that he is about to reveal the divine essence of the Father (= His Name) in the act of glorification on the cross (John 12:28). Although the Gospel of Truth elsewhere teaches that Jesus died on "the cross" (p. 20,25-27), here it is specifically stated that the purpose of his life and death is to glorify the greatness of his Father's name, i.e. to accentuate the greatness of God's existence. The existence of the same God who was previously known only as "the Invisible One" (p. 38,19) and "the Depth" (p. 40,27) can be seen now in the life of His Son. Thus, the Johannine teaching that the Father has given His name to the Son (John 17:11-12) is reinterpreted by the author of the Gospel of Truth. The important thing for the Gnostic writer is not that Jesus has made known to man the nature of God as "Father" but that he has himself become the name as a manifestation of the existence of God.

(2) The Response of Man. The term ὄνομα appears six times in the Fourth Gospel as that which man believes in for salvation, four of which represent the acceptance of the name of Christ (John 1:12; 2:23; 20:31; cf. 15:21) and two of which represent its rejection (John 3:18; cf. 5:43). Because the Father sends the Holy Spirit in the name of Christ to teach men all these things (John 14:16), it is possible for man to be united with Christ in the Church by believing "on his name" (εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ), i.e. by believing "in him" as the Son of God (John 1:12; 2:23; cf. 20:31). Those who believe in the Son are given the "privilege" (ἐξουσία) of becoming "children of God" (τέκνα θεοῦ) (John 1:12). This privilege enables them to enter into divine fellowship with the Father which is expressed by praying in the name of Jesus (John 14:13-14; 15:16; 16:23-24 and 26). "To ask" (αἰτεῖν) in his name means not only to ask by calling on his name but also to ask according to his will. Such prayer in the name of Jesus is an expression of faith that he has "come forth from God" and that he is, therefore, the Son of God. The unity of the Father and the Son is further expressed by the fact that prayer in the name of Jesus can be directed to the Father as well as to the Son (John 14:13-14). The possibility of entering into fellowship with God through Christ, however, is rejected by His own people, Israel (John 1:11; 3:11). Their rejection is described as "not believing in the name of the only Son of God (John 3:18). Instead, the Jews looked for another who would come "in his own name" (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τῷ ἰδίῳ), i.e. one who would not represent and reveal the nature of God as Jesus did (John 5:43). Jesus then says to the disciples: "They (= the Jews) will do all these things unto you for my name's sake " (διὰ τὸ ὄνομα μου). In other words, the hostility of the Jews is caused by the fact

that the disciples proclaim Christ as being what he revealed himself to be, the Son of the living God (John 15:21).

The Gospel of Truth is also concerned with the relationship of the idea of "the name" to man. The term ⲣⲉⲛ occurs nine times with reference to the divine essence of the Father in man, five of which apply to the true Gnostics who are "sons of the name" (p. 38,28; cf. p. 21,27 and 29; p. 39,16, 28, and 33) and four of which apply to the non-Gnostics who do not have "a name" (p. 22,1; cf. p. 21,31 and 34; p. 39,13). The subject is again treated as a unified whole (p. 21,25 - p. 22,15).

p. 21,25 Those
whose name He (= the Father) foreknew
were called at the end,
so that (ὡς) (the) one who has knowledge
is he whose name the Father has pronounced.
30 For (γάρ) he whose name has not been pronounced
remains ignorant.
For how would one
hear, if his name has not been called?
For (γάρ) he who remains
35 ignorant to the end is a creature (πλάσμα)
of forgetfulness, and he will be
destroyed with it. If (it were) not (so),
why do the wretches not have
p. 22,1 a name? (Why) do they not hear (lit. have)
the call (lit. voice)? Thus,
if anyone has knowledge, he is a being from
above. If he is called,
5 he hears, answers,
and turns toward Him who calls
him, and ascends to Him and
knows how he is called.
Since he has knowledge, he does
10 the will of the One who called
him. He desires to please Him
(and) finds (lit. receives) rest. The name
of the One (= the Father)
becomes his. He who has knowledge in
this manner perceives whence he came
15 and whither he is going.

This passage divides all men into two main categories on the basis of whether their name has been or has not been pronounced by the Father. On the one hand, those "whose name the Father has pronounced" (p. 21,29) are the true Gnostics whom "He foreknew" (ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥⲣ̄ ϣⲁⲣⲡ̄ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ) in the beginning and who "were called" (ⲁⲩⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ) at the end (p. 21,26-27). On the other hand, those "whose name has not been pronounced" (p. 21,30) are the non-Gnostics who "remain ignorant to the end" (ϥⲟⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲁⲧⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ ϣⲁ ⲧⲑⲁⲏ) and are called "creatures of forgetfulness" (ⲡⲗⲁⲥⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲧⲃϣⲉ) (p. 21,31 and 35-36).[78] That which distinguishes the true Gnostic from the non-Gnostic is the fact that "the name of the One (= the Father) becomes his" (ϣⲁⲣⲉⲡⲣⲉⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲉⲉⲓ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲉϥ), i.e. the divine essence of the Father dwells in him (p. 22,12-13). For this reason the true Gnostic comes to recognize himself as "a being from above" (ⲟⲩⲁ ⲃⲁⲗ ⲡⲉϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲥⲁⲛϩⲉ) and therefore looks forward to the time when he will "ascend" (ⲛ̄ϥ ϣⲉ ⲁϩⲣⲏⲓ) to the Father because His "Spirit" (or: "spiritual seed") is in him (p. 22,4-5 and 7). This idea is expressed in the familiar Gnostic formula: "He who has knowledge (ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ) in this manner perceives whence he came and whither he is going" (p. 22,13-15; cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I, 21,6, and *Exc. Theod.* 78,2). Therefore, genuine knowledge for the Gnostic is not the knowledge of God but the knowledge of one's being rooted in God.

The same teaching concerning the two main categories of men is reiterated elsewhere in slightly different language.

p. 38,25 Who then will be able to pronounce (*a*) *name*
for Him (= the Father)
this great name, except him (= the true Gnostic)
to whom the name belongs,
and the *sons of the name*
in whom *the name of the Father*

---

[78] The term "forgetfulness" (ⲃϣⲉ) signifies a "fogging" (ϩⲗⲁⲥⲧⲛ̄) (p. 17,12 and 31) of the human spirit. Whereas the true Gnostics can overcome this condition with knowledge, those who have no capacity for knowledge are "material" (ὕλη) (p. 31,1) and have no hope of salvation. In the fully developed Valentinian system they are called "material ones" (ὑλικοί). Cf. footnote 65.

30 has rested (and who)
have rested themselves again (πάλιν)
32 in His name.

p. 39,11 For he who does not exist (= the non-Gnostic)
has no name.
For (γάρ) what name will they give to him
who does not exist.
15 On the contrary, he who exists (= the true Gnostic)
exists with another name of His (= the Father) and
He alone knows it,
and it is the Father alone
19 who has the right (lit. ought) to name him.

The true Gnostics as "the sons of the name" (ⲚϢⲎⲢⲈ Ⲙ̄ⲠⲢⲈⲚ) are contrasted with the non-Gnostics who have "no name" (ⲘⲚⲦϤ̄ ⲢⲈⲚ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲈⲨ) (p. 38,38; p. 39,12). The difference between them is also expressed by viewing the true Gnostic as "he who exists" (ⲚⲦⲀϤ ⲈⲦϢⲞⲞⲠ) and the non-Gnostic as "he who does not exist" (ⲠⲈⲦⲈⲚϤ̄ ϢⲞⲞⲠ) (p. 39,11 and 15). True existence is, therefore, synonymous with being "sons of the name" and is associated only with those who have the knowledge of their divine origin in the Father. The lack of a name is brought about by forgetfulness and is a condition in which the attainment of this knowledge is impossible. Thus, the doctrine of predestination which is taught here emphasizes the call of the Father and eliminates the choice of man.

The Fourth Gospel also contains a doctrine of predestination, but the foreknowledge and call of the Father are carefully balanced by the free will and choice of man. On the one hand, the Gospel of John teaches that "the Son gives life to whom he will" (John 5:21; cf. John 17:2 and 9) and that he who is of God hears the words of God" (John 8:47; cf. John 10:26-29). Jesus also says, "No one can come to me unless it is granted him by the Father" (John 6:65; cf. John 6:44) and "I am not speaking of you all; I know whom I have chosen" (John 13:18; cf. John 15:16). On the other hand, the element of human responsibility is brought into the picture when Jesus says, "Him who comes to me I will not cast out" (John 6:37; cf. John 6:40) and "If any man's will is to do His will, he shall know whether the teaching is from God or whether I am speaking on my own authority" (John 7:17). It is also apparent in the fact that all men have the choice of "believing on the name" (πιστεύοσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα) of Christ (John 1:12; 2:23; cf. 20:31) and thus becoming "children of God" (τέκνα θεοῦ) (John 1:12; 11:52; cf. 12:36) or the choice of rejecting Christ by "not believing in the name" (μὴ πεπίστευκεν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα) of the only Son of God (John 3:18) and thus remaining children "of your father the Devil" (ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου) (John 8:44). The understanding of predestination which is presented in the Fourth Gospel is, therefore, expressed paradoxically, i.e. the divine initiative of *God's calling* is set over against the human response of *man's choice*. Since the ones who are called can be recognized only by the fact that they "believe on the name of Christ," the prior fact of one's capacity for salvation is verified "from the latter fact" (*ex post facto*) of faith.

It now becomes clear that the Gospel of Truth capitalizes on the Johannine ambiguity which is contained in this *ex post facto* understanding of predestination and only emphasizes the teaching concerning the divine initiative of God's calling. By stressing only the one-sided teaching of the call of the Father, the delicate balance between the divine call and the human response is broken. Whereas the Fourth Gospel leaves room for man to accept or refect the Father's revelation of Himself in the life of His Son, the Gospel of Truth assumes that some men are saved by nature because their name has been pronounced by the Father and that some men have no capacity for salvation because their name has not been pronounced. The element of choice seems to be limited to "those of the middle" (ⲚⲚⲀⲦⲘⲎⲦⲈ) (p. 17,32) who "do not yet exist" but who have the possibility of true existence, i.e. the potential Gnostics. In this way the Gospel of Truth foreshadows the later division of all men into three distinct classes: "spiritual" men (πνευματικοί), men of "soul" (ψυχικοί), and "material" men (ὑλικοί).

The peculiar interests of the Gnostic writer are becoming increasingly apparent. Concerning the manifestation of the name of the Father by the Son, he takes advantage of the Johannine ambiguity and develops his teaching in the direction of God's existence rather than his relation to man as "Father." Concerning the presence of the divine essence of the Father in man, he accepts only the aspect of Johannine teaching which corroborates his own distinctive emphasis upon a one-sided doctrine of predestination.

The opening words of the Gnostic document call attention to the idea of "truth." More than any of the other terms being considered, it is a kind of unifying theme for the entire treatise. The comparison of the leading ideas of the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth will be concluded with a discussion of "the truth."

VI. THE TRUTH (ἡ ἀλήθεια)

The idea of "the truth" reaches its most developed form in the New Testament in the Gospel of John. The term ἀλήθεια occurs a total of twenty-five times (as well as twenty times in the Johannine Epistles).[79]

---

[79] R. Bultmann, ἀλήθεια in G. Kittel's *T. W. N. T.*, 1 (1933), 239-251, insbes. 245-248. Cf. F. Büchsel, *Der Begriff der Wahrheit in dem Evangelium und den Briefen des Johannes* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1911); R. Bultmann, "Untersuchungen zum Johannesevangelium: Ἀλήθεια ," (continued next page)

It is used three ways with respect to its Hebrew, Greek, and Christian meaning. The ordinary Hebrew usage appears once as that which has validity or stability and is not unrighteous (John 3:21; cf. 1 John 1:6). John accepts the Jewish teaching that "truth" is "something to be done" (ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν) in the course of keeping the faith and supplements it with a new teleological emphasis. For John "truth" also implies something that is provisional which is moving toward its goal. The ordinary Greek usage appears seven times as that which corresponds to fact and is not false (John 5:33; 8:40 and 44-46; 16:7). John accepts the Greek teaching that "truth" is "something to be thought or believed" with reference to the actual state of affairs. This Greek understanding of the term comes into sharp focus in the Johannine conflict between truth and falsehood (lit. "lies") (John 8:44). The distinctive Christian usage occurs nineteen times as the divine revelation of the purpose of God in Jesus Christ (John 1:14 and 17; 4:23-24; 8:32; 14:6; 17:17 and 19; 18:37-38) which is continually made available through the work of the Holy Spirit (John 14:17; 15:26; 16:13). Instead of referring to human action or human apprehension, this understanding of "truth" refers to divine revelation. It is the Greek and Christian usages of the term that provide the basis of comparison with the thought of the Gospel of Truth.

(1) The Greek Usage. From the Greek point of view ἀλήθεια means "truth" as opposed to falsehood. As such, it denotes either that "the abstract quality of truthfulness" or that "the contents of the statement" are compatible with the facts. The two meanings are so close that they

---

(footnote 79 continued) *Z. N. T. W.*, 27 (1928), 113-163; T. Henkel, *Wahrheit im Johannesevangelium und bei Luther* (Helsinki: Akateeminen kirjakanppa, 1944); C. H. Dodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 170-178; and Otto A. Piper, "Truth" in G. A. Buttrick's *I.D.B.*, 4 (1962), 713-717, esp. 716.

easily merge into one another. This usage can be detected in the Fourth Gospel with respect to the mission of John the Baptist. Jesus says, "You sent to John, and he has borne witness to the truth" (τῇ ἀληθείᾳ) (John 5:33), i.e. his mission was trustworthy in preparation for my ministry (cf. John 1:19-23). Jesus also says the same thing concerning himself: "Nevertheless I tell you the truth (ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω ὑμῖν); it is to your advantage that I go away" (John 16:7). Because the disciples were deceived by the superficial appearance of things, he removes their false impressions by telling them the "truth." He is saying, "It is no lie that I am telling you; it is really true that my departure will be to your advantage." In his disputation with the Jews Jesus describes himself as "a man who has told you the truth" (ἄνθρωπον ὃς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑμῖν λελάληκα) (John 8:40), i.e. what is true in contrast to what is false. The same idea is repeated when he says, "Because I tell the truth (ἐγὼ δὲ ὅτι τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω), you do not believe me" (John 8:45) and "If I tell the truth (εἰ ἀλήθειαν λέγω), why do you not believe me?" (John 8:46b). The phrase λαλεῖν or λέγειν τὴν ἀλήθειαν means to make a statement in accordance with the facts relevant to the situation, as opposed to telling a lie. The natural antithesis to "telling the truth" is, therefore, "to speak what is false" (λαλεῖν τὸ ψεῦδος). This quality of falsehood is traced to the Devil who "did not stand in the truth because there is no truth in him" (ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ οὐκ ἕστηκεν, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν αὐτῷ) (John 8:44a). Instead, he is "a liar" (ψεύστης) who speaks "what is false" (τὸ ψεῦδος) (John 8:44b), i.e. falsehood as opposed to truth (cf. 1 John 1:8; 2:4). In other words, Jesus specifies the nature of the conflict between him and the Devil as the opposition of truth to falsehood. This opposition repeats itself in the children of the two spiritual heads. The understanding which Jesus has of falsehood is closely related to sin when he asks, "Which of you convicts me of sin?" (περὶ ἁμαρτίας) (John 8:46a). Falsehood within will manifests itself in outward deeds of sin. This view is confirmed by the related passage: "He who commits sin (ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν) is of the devil; for the devil has sinned (ἁμαρτάνει) from the beginning" (1 John 3:8). Because the one who commits sin is "of the devil" whose nature is falsehood, he also becomes "a liar" (ψεύστης) (John 8:55; cf. 1 John 1:10; 2:4 and 22; 4:20; 5:10) in the course of following the promptings of the Devil instead of trusting in Christ.

The Gospel of Truth expresses its understanding of "truth" in the term ⲘⲎⲈ (or in the full form with the abstract prefix ⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲘⲎⲈ). The Greek usage is reflected in the three occurrences of the term in connection with the pre-cosmic struggle between Truth and Error (p. 17,17, 21, and 25). In this context "Truth" (ⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲘⲎⲈ) is the principle of cosmic order, and "Error" (ⲠⲖⲀⲚⲎ) (p. 17,15, 29, and 36) is the antagonistic principle of the universe.

p. 17,4 Therefore (ἐπειδή),
the All sought for Him from whom it
had come forth, and the All had been
inside of the Illimitable,
Inconceivable (One)
who is superior to every thought, because the
ignorance of the Father produced terror
and fear. And (δέ) terror
became dense like a fog,
so that no one was able to see.
Because of this,
Error (πλάνη) became strong. It worked on its
hylic substance (ὕλη)
vainly
because it did not know the Truth.

It (= Error) molded (it) (= its hylic substance)
into a fashioned form (πλάσμα),
trying to make in beauty
20 the equivalent of Truth (of which it was
naturally ignorant).
This, then, was not a humiliation for
the Illimitable, Inconceivable (One).
For (γάρ) the terror
and the forgetfulness and the figure (πλάσμα)
25 of falsehood were as nothing, whereas the
established Truth
is unchanging, unperturbed, (and)
completely beautiful.
For this reason look with scorn (καταφρονεῖτε)
upon
Error (πλάνη). It behaves in this manner - it has no
30 root in itself (and) it originated in
a fog with respect to the Father. Upon coming into
existence,
it (= Error) produces works (ἔργον) and
forgetfulness and fears, in order (ἵνα),
by these means, to beguile those of
35 the middle (= the potential Gnostics) and to take them captive
(αἰχμαλωτίζειν).
The forgetfulness of Error (πλάνη)
was not revealed. It did not become
p. 18,1 [thought] beside the Father. Forgetfulness
did not originate with the Father, although
it came into existence because of Him.
That which came into existence through Him
(= the Father) is
5 knowledge.

In the Gospel of Truth the blame is placed on Error for the fact that the world which God created did not turn out perfectly. The intention of Error was apparently good at first since it attempted to mold its fashioned form into "the equivalent of Truth" (N̄TⲀⲂⲂⲒⲰ N̄ϮⲘN̄ⲦⲘⲎⲈ) (p. 17,20), but this was impossible "because it did not know the Truth" (ⲈⲘⲠⲈⲤⲤⲞⲨⲰⲚ N̄ϮⲘN̄ⲦⲘⲎⲈ) (p. 17,17). Because of this "ignorance of the Father" (p. 17,10), Error gives expression to "terror and forgetfulness and the figure of falsehood" (p. 17,23-25). Thus, the idea of Error is apparently introduced to explain the origin of evil out of the incompleteness which results from ignorance of the Father. In this way the monistic principle is consistently maintained since everything proceeds from one source, i.e. the perfect Father. The opposite of Error is "the established Truth" (ϯⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲏⲉ ⲉⲧⲥⲙⲁⲛ̄ⲧ) which is "unchanging, unperturbed, (and) completely beautiful" (p. 17,25-27). Therefore, the idea of Truth is used to express the unifying principle of good in the universe which restores all the creatures of forgetfulness to their true existence in the Father.[80]

Although the specific term "error" does occur in the Synoptic Gospels (Matt. 27:64) and the Johannine Epistles (1 John 4:6), it is not used in the Gospel of John. Instead, John presents the antithesis of truth as the inward quality of "falsehood" which expresses itself outwardly in sinful acts. He understands this quality of "falsehood" to be the main characteristic of the nature of the Devil and of all who follow his promptings. The Gospel of Truth reinterprets this antithetical principle by removing it from the realm of ethical practice to the realm of metaphysical speculation. The same tendency is also seen with regard to the term "truth." For John "truth" as opposed to falsehood is something that is expressed in words and deeds. The Gospel of Truth, however, transfers this term from the realm of ethics to that of metaphysics. The inspiration for this shift of emphasis is the Platonic contrast between the realm of ultimate reality and the realm of phenomena which are only shadows, representations, or symbols of the real.

---

[80] The use of Error as a hypostasized appellative for the antagonistic principle of the universe is a significant characteristic of Valentinian Gnosis. Heracleon's Commentary on John gives expression to this view when it says: "That which belongs to the Father is lost in the deep matter (ὕλη) of Error" (πλάνη) (Origen, Com. on John, XIII, 20). This conflict between truth and error is not limited to the Gnostics since it is also found in the New Testament. In 1 John 4:6 "the spirit of error" (τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης) is placed in justaposition with "the spirit of truth" (τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας). In this context "error" is a simple appellative with the connotation of "wandering or roaming from the path of truth" and is used to characterize so-called "inspired" utterances which convey false doctrine. Cf. C. H. Dodd, The Johannine Epistles (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1946), pp. 96-106.

For example, in his allegory of the Cave Plato identifies the sun itself with ultimate reality and views the light of the sun as artificial and unreal (*Rep*. 506D - 517A). Thus, the author of the Gospel of Truth attempts to explain the original conflict in the world of invisible realities of which the visible world is only a copy. Although the awareness of a conflict is found in both the Gospel of Truth and the Gospel of John, the subject matter is very different. The practical interest of John is quickly overshadowed by the philosophical interest of the Gnostic writer.

John makes use of the Greek understanding of ἀλήθεια as "the quality of truthfulness which is compatible with the facts" in such a way that it easily merges with the Christian interpretation of "the revelation of the purpose of God in Jesus Christ." The blending of the two usages is very clear when Jesus says, I am "a man who has told you the truth *which* *I* *heard* *from* *God*" (ἣν ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ) (John 8:40). The quality of truthfulness is at the same time "the truth" concerning his revelation of the eternal purpose of God. On the contrary, the Devil does not simply "tell lies" but utters "the Lie" (τὸ ψεῦδος) (John 8:44), i.e. the final denial of God's revelation in Christ.

(2) The Christian Usage. The key to the Christian understanding of "the truth" as the divine revelation of the purpose of God is presented in the familiar words of Jesus: "You will know *the* *truth* (τὴν ἀλήθειαν), and *the* *truth* (ἡ ἀλήθεια) will make you free (John 8:32; cf. 17:3). In this case "the truth" is not only the object of man's knowledge of God but also the subject of God's revelation to man. It is that which God has made known of Himself in Jesus Christ which enables men to be free from the dominion of sin (which is characterized

by σάρξ). This is much more than knowing the truth in an intellectual sense which gives man freedom of thought and conscience. Instead, what Jesus promises to the disciples is liberty through knowledge of the purpose of God. Such knowledge of the eternal plan of redemption is given only by Christ. Thus, "truth" in the Fourth Gospel comes to mean both the purpose itself and the revelation of the purpose.

It is significant that Jesus specifically identifies himself with "the truth" in a passage which is unique to the New Testament.

> Jesus said to him, "I am the way and the truth and the life; no one comes to the Father but by me" (John 14:6).

Here the term "truth" is used to further explain the meaning of "the way" (ἡ ὁδός) by which men come to God. Because Jesus is the means of access to God who is the source of all truth, he is himself "the truth" (ἡ ἀλήθεια) for men (cf. John 14:7 and 9). Therefore, "the truth" is not the teaching about God transmitted by Jesus but God's purpose working itself out in the life of Jesus. The same thing is implied in the assertion that Jesus is full "of grace and truth" (χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας), i.e. God's true purpose is communicated to men as a gracious gift in Jesus Christ (John 1:14 and 17). It is also expressed in the words of Jesus: "Thy word is truth" (ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστιν) (John 17:17b), meaning that the Father's word is in accordance with His plan for the redemption of the world. When believers are sanctified or "set apart" by Christ "in truth" (ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ) (John 17:17a), it means that the purpose of God which is manifested in the Word will make it possible for them to be out of the world's sphere of power. The fact that the world is indifferent to the purpose of God is expressed by the question of Pilate, "What is truth?"

(τί ἐστιν ἀλήθεια;) (John 18:38). The answer is given indirectly in the subsequent drama of the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ which represent the ultimate expression of God's purpose in human history. It is in this same context that Jesus states his purpose for coming into the world as bearing witness "to the truth" (τῇ ἀληθείᾳ), i.e. to the divine purpose of God (John 18:37a). Because of God's act of redemption in Christ, it is also possible for man to be "of the truth" (ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας) (John 18:37b) or to be "of God" (ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ) (John 7:17; 8:47; cf. 1 John 3:10; 4:1; 5:19), i.e. it is possible for truth to become the very nature of man.

Closely related to the Johannine teaching that Christ "is" the truth concerning God's purpose is the fact that he also "reveals" this truth to man. The latter aspect of the Johannine idea is contained in the conversation of Jesus with Pilate.

> Jesus answered, "You say that I am a king. For this I was born, and for this I have come into the world, to bear witness to *the truth*" (John 18:37a).

Here Jesus bears witness to the purpose of God because he is himself the revelation of the truth of God to man. This revelation makes it possible for the believer to live in an atmosphere of worship "in spirit and truth" (ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ), i.e. conformable to the divine nature which is spirit and determined by the truth which God has revealed in Christ (John 4:23-24). This revelation is made available to man through "the Spirit of Truth" (τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας) or "the Spirit who communicates truth" (John 14:17; 15:26; 16:13a), and upon entering the domain of eternal life the Holy Spirit continues to unfold the meaning of man's existence by guiding him "into all *the truth*" (εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν) (John 16:13b). In this way the receiving of the message of God's revelation is followed by the continual unfolding of the meaning of God's purpose. Therefore, it is the identification of the eternal purpose with a concrete person known to history and the revelation of this purpose to man which make up the distinctive Christian usage of the term "truth."

The Christian usage of ⲘⲎⲈ in the Gospel of Truth is reflected in the thirteen occurrences of the term in connection with the revelation of God, eight of which identify the truth with Jesus Christ (p. 16,31; p. 18,20; p. 26,28 and 30-31; p. 32,35) as the basis for man's existence in the Father (p. 23,9; p. 42,25 and 26) and five of which refer to the revelation of the Father by Christ (p. 16,33; p. 26,33 and 34; p. 36,12) and by the Holy Spirit (p. 27,1). It is significant that the Gnostic writer uses ⲘⲎⲈ for the revelation of truth in the life of Jesus Christ.

p. 26,23 Ever since (ἐπειδή)
knowledge which is
25 its annihilation has approached it,
Error with all its emanations has been empty
since there is nothing in it. (Then)
truth (= Jesus) appeared.
All its (= truth's) emanations came to know it (= truth);
30 they greeted (ἀσπάζεσθαι) the Father in truth
and perfect power which
united them with the Father.
For (γάρ) everyone (who has the capacity for knowledge)
loves truth
because truth is (the) mouth
35 of the Father. His tongue is the
Holy Spirit (πνεῦμα) who joins
p. 27,1 him (everyone who loves truth) to truth (and) attaches
him by his tongue to (the) mouth of the Father,
when (= at which time) he should
receive the Holy Spirit (πνεῦμα).
5 This (truth) is the manifestation of the
Father and His revelation
to the Aeons (αἰών). He revealed
8 that which was hidden by Him (= His hidden self) and
explained it.

This important passage begins with an account of the pre-cosmic annihilation of the antagonistic principle of the universe called "Error" by the emergence of the unifying principle of the universe called "Truth" (p. 26,26-28). Moreover, the change from metaphysical transcendence to spiritual immanence is indicated by the fact that truth "appeared" (ⲁⲥⲉⲓ̈ ⲁⲧⲙⲏⲧⲉ) (p. 26,28), implying that the appearance of Christ as a heavenly messenger is the revelation of truth. The decisive factor is the "knowledge" (ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ) (p. 26,24) which the revelation of truth makes known to all the empty emanations of Error, thus enabling them to come to know the Father "in truth" (ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲏⲉ) (p. 26,30), i.e. by means of the revelation of "the truth" in Jesus Christ. The revelation of the truth is not just for the transcendent entities of the universe but also for man because "everyone (who has the capacity for knowledge) loves *truth*" (ⲟⲩⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲙⲁⲓ̈ⲉ ⲛϯⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲏⲉ) (p. 26,33). The Father's desire to have all men come to know Him can be realized since "*truth* is (the) mouth of the Father" (ϯⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲏⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲣⲱϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲱⲧ) (p. 26,34-35), i.e. because that which comes out of the mouth of the Father is His Word (= the *Logos*) which is the revelation of "the truth." Man becomes related to the *Logos* by means of the "Holy Spirit" who attaches him to "the truth," just as "the tongue" attaches words to "the mouth" (p. 26,35 - p. 27,2; cf. John 20:22). Lest the larger cosmological dimension be overlooked, the Gnostic writer reiterates that this revelation of the Father is also intended for all the "Aeons" (αἰών) (p. 27,5-7). The entire universe finds the true origin of its existence in the Father because "His hidden self" has been made known in the revelation of "the truth" in Jesus Christ. Thus, it seems that "truth" is used in this context as a name for Jesus who is the embodiment of its content and the means of its revelation. By reading between the lines, it is possible to detect the influence of the Johannine Prologue which begins with the pre-cosmic existence of the *Logos* with the Father (John 1:1), continues with the coming "of truth" into the world in the person of Jesus Christ (John 1:14 and 17), and concludes with a statement of the purpose of his coming as making the Father known to man (John 1:18).

The distinctive Johannine use of ἀλήθεια also comes to the surface in the references to Jesus as the "way" (ⲘⲀⲈⲒⲦ) (p. 18,19 and 20; p. 31,29).

p. 18,15 This hidden mystery (μυστήριον) (= the gospel)
has enlightened those who were in darkness
by means of Jesus Christ.
He (= Jesus) has enlightened them out of forgetfulness
(and) has given (them) a way (into knowledge).
20 And (δέ) this way is the truth which
he (= Jesus) has taught them. For this reason
Error (πλάνη) became angry with him, (so) it
persecuted him. It was endangered by Him,
(so) it annihilated him. He was nailed to a (cross of) wood
(but)
25 he became a fruit of the knowledge of
the Father.

p. 31,26 He abolished them (= the forces of Error) with power
and defeated them (lit. put them to shame) with
knowledge.
He became a
way for those who were straying
30 and knowledge for those who
were ignorant, a discovery for those
who were seeking, and a support
for those who were trembling, (and)
34 a purity for those who were defiled.

The pre-cosmic struggle between Truth and Error is re-enacted on the earth in the conflict between Jesus Christ and Error. As a direct antithesis to Jesus, Error plays the same role in the Gospel of Truth as Satan does in the Fourth Gospel, i.e. both resist the threat of being dethroned by Christ who is the embodiment of Truth. Rather than lose its very being and succumb to the power of truth, Error fights for its life by persecuting

Christ and attempting to annihilate him (p. 18,22-24). The result is that Christ undergoes the humiliation of the crucifixion and thereby shows the superiority of truth. For this reason he is able to enlighten those who are in a state of "darkness" which is characterized by "forgetfulness" and to show them the "way" (ⲘⲀⲈⲒⲦ) into knowledge which is the "truth" (ⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲘⲎⲈ) which he taught them in the act of humiliation on the cross (p. 18,15-21). That which Error expected to be the defeat of Truth was in reality the victory of Truth and the defeat of Error (p. 31,26-27). Therefore, Jesus becomes "a way (ⲞⲨⲘⲀⲈⲒⲦ) for those who were straying and knowledge (ⲞⲨⲤⲀⲨⲚⲈ) for those who were ignorant" (p. 31,29-31). The influence of the Fourth Gospel is apparent in the interpretation of the crucifixion as the defeat of the forces of Error (cf. John 12:31-32) and in the claim of Jesus to be "the way" in which man comes to know the true origin of his existence in the Father (cf. John 14:6).

The idea of "truth" in the Fourth Gospel also provides the inspiration for the opening words of the document - "the gospel of (the) truth" (p. 16,31). Having already decided that these words are more than a title, the key to their meaning lies in the use of the term "truth" as a kind of unifying theme for the entire work. If the latter part of the expression ⲠⲈⲨⲀⲄⲄⲈⲖⲒⲞⲚ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲘⲎⲈ has been interpreted correctly as an appositive genitive, then it is apparent that "truth" is the distilled essence which is the real meaning of the "good news." In this sense truth "is" the good news and means three things simultaneously. (a) Truth is the nature of the Father who desires that all the universe be incorporated into His true Being. This is the meaning of the expression "the Father of Truth" (ⲠⲒⲰⲦ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ⲦⲘⲎⲈ) (p. 16,33; cf. John 17:3).

(b) Truth is the revelation of divine reality in Jesus Christ which enables all creatures to return to their heavenly origin in the Pleroma. This is expressed in the statement that "He (= the Father) revealed him (= Christ) as a (means by which all creatures can return to the) Pleroma, that is, (through) the discovery of the light of the truth" (ⲠⲞⲨⲀⲈⲒⲚ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲘⲎⲈ) (= Christ) (p. 36,10-12; cf. John 1:4; 14:6). (c) Truth is the goal of man which enables him to find the fulfilment of his existence in the Father. This is the basis for referring to men as "characters of truth" (ϨⲚ̄ⲤϨⲈⲈⲒ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ϮⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲘⲎⲈ) (p. 23,8-9), i.e. individual members who are incorporated into the Father of Truth by the revelation of Himself in Jesus Christ. Accordingly, men are exhorted to "speak concerning the truth (ⲀⲦⲘⲎⲈ) (= Christ) to those who seek it (p. 32,35-36; cf. John 8:31-32). It can also be said that those who are thus incorporated into the Father "have no labor nor (οὔτε) are they entangled in the search for truth (ⲠⲔⲰⲦⲈ Ⲙ̄ⲦⲘⲎⲈ) but (ἀλλά) they are indeed the truth (ⲦⲘⲎⲈ), and the Father is in them and they are in the Father" (p. 42,23-28; cf. John 17:17 and 22-23).

Therefore, the influence of John largely accounts for the use of the term "truth" in the Gnostic document. The conflict between truth and falsehood in John is reinterpreted in the Gospel of Truth as the conflict between Truth and Error. By supplementing the Johannine teaching with his own mythological framework, the Gnostic writer departs from the practical interest of John in favor of his own cosmological interest in the origin of all things in the Father. Instead of following John's description of the victory of Christ over Satan in his death on the cross, the Gnostic writer sees this event foreshadowed in the pretemporal victory of Truth over Error in the Pleroma. According to John, the result is that the victory of Christ makes it possible for man to know the Father. According to the Gospel of Truth, the result is that the symbolical death of Christ on the cross makes it possible for man to know the true origin of his existence in the Father. Whereas the Fourth Gospel emphasizes the fulfilment of God's purpose for the redemption of man in the death and resurrection of Christ, the Gospel of Truth stresses the fulfilment of man's existence in union with the Father by means of the appearance of the divine messenger, Jesus Christ.

The interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Gospel of Truth has been elucidated in the course of the comparison of the main theological ideas which the two documents share in common. The underlying influence of the Fourth Gospel upon the Gnostic writer is the best explanation for the prominent use of the designation for the Godhead as "the Father," for the understanding of "the Logos" as the divine messenger who is the revelation of "the truth," for the communication of the divine essence of the Father as "the name" which is given to "the Son," and for the illumination of man's true origin from above which is conveyed by "the Spirit." Although the Gnostic writer relies heavily upon the terminology of the Fourth Gospel with respect to these six leading ideas, the way in which he assimilates them into the Gospel of Truth gives evidence of a drastic departure from the thought of the Fourth Gospel. The prominent use of the Johannine term for the Godhead does not alter the fact that the Gnostic writer views the Father from the metaphysical standpoint of cosmology more than from the practical standpoint of redemption. The author of the Gospel of Truth immerses himself in the familiar Johannine ideas of the

Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, but he comes out with a unitarian view of God. He uses the Johannine idea of the Logos, but he limits the function of the Logos to the communication of the divine message to man that his true existence is in the Father. He uses the Johannine idea of "the truth," but the emphasis has been shifted from the true knowledge of a purely transcendental God to the knowledge of the divine root in man. Thus, it is quite clear that the author of the Gnostic treatise is using the terminology of the Fourth Gospel to suit his own particular theological purpose. For this reason he consciously emphasizes only those aspects of the Johannine teaching which can be made to fit into his own Gnostic system. That which appeals to him most in the Fourth Gospel is the Johannine language of soteriology and Christology, but in the process of being assimilated into his pattern of thought it becomes overshadowed by his own Gnostic cosmology and anthropology.

The use which the author of the Gospel of Truth makes of the Fourth Gospel might give the initial impression that his thought emerges quite innocently from some of the basic presuppositions of John. Upon closer examination the literary use of the Gospel of John is actually more like a craftsman taking individual pieces from a beautiful mosaic and reworking them into his own preconceived design. Although many of the same pieces from the former mosaic are used again in the new design, the completed picture which emerges is no longer Christ's sacrifice for the redemption of man but man's existential awareness of his true existence in the Father. If this Gnostic document can be identified with the Evangelium Veritatis referred to by Irenaeus and was written by Valentinus himself, then a great deal of new light is shed upon the situation with which the early Church was faced in the middle of the second century. The reinterpretation of

Christianity in the Gospel of Truth still preserves enough of the familiar Biblical terminology to keep from offending the casual Christian reader and at the same time introduces him to a whole new world of existential awareness.

The presentation thus far has been limited to the leading "ideas" which the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth share in common. Without going further, the impression might be given that the two documents belong to the realm of timeless existence and are intended to challenge only the mind and intellect of the seeker. Both treatises, however, consciously present a way of salvation which seeks to challenge the will and emotion of man. It is at this point that the contrast between the two documents comes into sharpest focus. The Gospel of John presents the way of salvation as the actualization of God's purpose in history, whereas the "dehistoricizing" tendency of the Gospel of Truth limits the way of salvation to man's awareness of his true existence in the Father. This basic difference between a Biblical faith rooted in history and a divine existence rooted in man will become apparent by contrasting the predicament of man, the redemptive work of Christ, and the appropriation of eternal life.

CHAPTER THREE

A CONTRAST OF THE WAY OF SALVATION

The way of salvation which is presented in both the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth takes the form of a "gospel" (εὐαγγέλιον). An understanding of the historical development of this term will provide the context in which to appreciate its use in the Gospel of Truth and will prepare the way for its expression in the doctrine of salvation. The term itself becomes a good point of transition from the realm of ideas to the realm of action since the - ιον suffix denotes activity (in contrast to the - ια suffix which denotes the subject matter). In other words, the "gospel" is not a sequence of memoirs from a wise philosopher but the saving work of God in the life of Jesus Christ.

In the New Testament the term εὐαγγέλιον is found eight times in the Gospel of Mark, four times in the Gospel of Matthew, sixty times in the Epistles of Paul (including four occurrences in the Pastorals), but it is conspicuously absent from the Gospels of Luke and John.[81] In this connection the term "gospel" is associated with the saving message of Jesus and means "good news." In Matthew the fact that Jesus went about "preaching the gospel" (κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον) is distinguished from his teaching in the synagogues and his healing every disease and infirmity among the people (Matt. 4:23; 9:35; Lk. 9:2). The opening words of Mark - "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ" (Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγέλιον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) (Mark 1:1) - seem to indicate that the term "gospel" is used as a designation for the whole public ministry of Jesus, not just of the message brought by him. Each of the four Gospels eventually is called "The Good News (singular) According to (κατά) Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John," meaning the saving message of Jesus which has been recorded respectively by the four Evangelists. Such titles are by-products of the compiling of the New Testament into one collection. This fourfold Gospel, as it is known today, must have come into existence about A.D. 100. Exactly when the titles were abbreviated to the single word "Gospel" to denote the literary form itself is unknown.

---

[81] G. Friedrich, εὐαγγέλιον in G. Kittel's *T. W. N. T.*, 2 (1935), 718-734, insbes. 724-733. Cf. M. Burrows, "The Origin of the Term 'Gospel'," *J. B. L.*, 44 (1925), 21-33; J. Schniewind, *Evangelium: Ursprung und erste Gestalt des Begriffs Evangelium* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1927; W. H. P. Hatch, "The Primitive Christian Message," *J. B. L.*, 58 (1934), 1-13; and Otto A. Piper, "Gospel (Message)" in G. A. Buttrick's *I. D. B.*, 2 (1962), 442-448.

In the early Church of the second century the term "Gospel" comes to mean a "book" in which the good news is described. It occurs most frequently in the singular since the Church anxiously insists on the oneness of the good news. The earliest mention of the Gospel in the sense of a book is found in the *Didache* (c. A.D. 110). The quotation of the Lord's Prayer is introduced by the words: "You must not pray like the hypocrites, but 'pray as follows,' as the Lord bid us *in his Gospel*" (ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ) (*Did.*, VIII, 2; cf. XV, 3). A similar reference is found in the writings of Ignatius (c. A.D. 110): "When I heard some people saying, 'If I don't find it in the original documents, I do not believe *in the Gospel*' (ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ), I answered them, 'But it is written there'" (Philad., VIII, 2; cf. V, 1; IX, 2). It is clear that at this time "the Gospel" is something which the Church understands as a document or body of documents, to which it is sufficient to appeal without further specification. The collective term "Gospel" usually appears without the name of any author and refers to the four Gospels as a single unit. The earliest mention of the term "Gospels" in the plural is made by Justin Martyr who lived and worked at Rome about A.D. 150-160. He indicates that the "memoirs of the apostles" (ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων) were read in public services (Apol., I, 67), and it is learned elsewhere that the name popularly given to these recollections or memoirs is "Gospels" (Εὐαγγέλια) (Apol., I, 66). The fact that Tatian (c. A.D. 170) uses only the four canonical Gospels as the basis of his Diatessaron implies that they were known in Rome just past the middle of the second century. By the time of Irenaeus (A.D. 180) the four Gospels had attained a position of unquestioned authority. He views each one separately as "a written Gospel" (γραφὴν εὐαγγέλιον) (Adv. Haer., III, 1,1; cf. III, 11,8) and thinks that there can be no more or less than four. Thus, the use of the term has natural progression of development from "saving message" to "earthly ministry" to "literary document."

Instead of accepting the developed meaning of "literary document," the author of the Gospel of Truth goes back to the original meaning of "saving message." The contrast between Irenaeus and the Gnostic writer in the use of the term "gospel" in the title of the homily has already been discussed. Now it is appropriate to consider the use of the term from the standpoint of the entire Gnostic document.

In the Gospel of Truth the term "gospel" occurs four times, three of which appear as the Greek noun εὐαγγέλιον (p. 16,31; p. 17,2; p. 18,11-12) and one as the Coptic noun ϢⲘⲚⲞⲨϤⲈ (p. 34,35). The first two passages are closely related and will be treated together.

p. 16,31 The gospel (εὐαγγέλιον) of (the) truth is joy
to those who (by means of it = the gospel) have
received grace from
the Father of Truth in order to come to know Him
(= the Father)
34 by the power of the Logos (= the Saviour)...

p. 17,1 the designation
"gospel" (εὐαγγέλιον) is the revelation
of hope (ἐλπίς), since it signifies the discovery
4 for those who seek Him (= the Father).

The Gnostic writer does not intend for the opening words to be understood as a formal title - "the Gospel of Truth" - but as a statement of the theme of the writing - "the good news concerning the truth." This is true because εὐαγγέλιον is used in the original and literal sense of "glad tidings," not in the secondary and literary sense of a writing. That the tidings are glad is made clear right from the beginning by the descriptive word "joy" (ⲦⲈⲖⲎⲖ) which has the connotation of exaltation (cf. Lk. 1:14). There is a further description of the "glad tidings" in the second passage as "hope" (ἐλπίς) (p. 17,3; cf. p. 35,3) which has the connotation of expectation (cf. Rom. 8:24). In the Gospel of Truth this exaltation is based on the receiving of "grace" (ϨⲘⲀⲦ) (p. 16,32; cf. p. 34,2; p. 36, 3, 5, and 7; p. 37,12), i.e. the possibility of standing in God's favor, and this expectation is based on the revelation of hope, i.e. the assurance of sharing the glory of God (cf. John 1:14, 16, and 17). The term ἐλπίς points beyond itself to the object of hope which is the "discovery" (ϬⲒⲚⲈ) of salvation for those who seek the Father (p. 17,3-4). In the same way ⲦⲈⲖⲎⲖ points beyond itself to the fulfilment of joy which is the assurance of salvation for those who know the Father (p. 16,31-33). The possibility of the discovery comes from the "grace" which goes out from the Father of Truth by means of the power of the Logos (= the Saviour), and the confirmation of the discovery comes from the "knowledge" (= *Gnosis*) of the divine origin of one's existence in the Father by means of the appearance of the *Logos*. The thought here is reminiscent of the First Epistle of John:

> And we know that the Son of God has come and has given us understanding to know Him (= the Father) who is true; and we are in Him who is true, in His Son Jesus Christ" (1 John 5:20).

Therefore, the "good news" in this Gnostic homily is (a) the revelation of the truth about the Father - that He desires man to seek and find Him - and (b) the revelation of the truth about man - that he can discover the true meaning of his existence by coming to know the Father. The connecting link between the two is the *Logos* or the "Saviour" (σωτήρ) (p. 16,34) by whose power the desire of the Father is communicated and the longing of man is fulfilled.

The third passage in which the term "gospel" occurs specifies the way in which salvation is appropriated by man.

p. 18,4 That which came into existence through Him (= the
Father) is
knowledge. This was revealed (as the gospel) in
order that (ἵνα)
forgetfulness might be destroyed
and that the Father might be known. *Since* (ἐπειδή)
forgetfulness came into existence because
the Father was not known, then (τότε)
10 *if they come to know the Father,*
forgetfulness from that moment on ceases to exist.
This (is)
the *gospel* (εὐαγγέλιον) of Him whom they
seek, (the gospel) which has been revealed to the
perfect (ones) through the mercies
15 of the Father. This hidden mystery (μυστήριον)
(= the gospel)
has enlightened those who were in darkness
by means of Jesus Christ.
He (= Jesus) has enlightened them out of forgetfulness
(and) has given (them) a way (into knowledge).
And (δέ) this way is the truth which
21 he (= Jesus) has taught them.

When the author says, "*This* (is) the gospel," the specific antecedent of the pronoun "this" is "knowledge" (ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ) (p. 18,5). The larger antecedent of the pronoun is the formula in which the act of "coming to know the Father" is the means of appropriating salvation (p. 18,7-11). This formula (which is underscored in the text) has been identified by Hans Jonas[82] as a key to the innermost secret of Valentinian thought. It occurs again in the Gospel of Truth in a slightly different form.

p. 24,28 Since (ἐπειδή) deficiency came into existence
because the Father was not known,
then (τότε), if they come
to know the Father, deficiency
32 from that moment on ceases to exist.

In this version of the formula it appears that "deficiency" (ϣⲧⲁ) is synonymous with "forgetfulness" (ⲃ̄ϣⲉ) in the former passage. The use of "deficiency" here also agrees with the citation of the formula by Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.*, I, 21,4) in connection with his refutation of the Valentinian Marcus.

> Perfect salvation is the knowledge itself of the Ineffable Greatness: for *since deficiency and passion came into existence through ignorance, therefore the whole system springing from the ignorance is dissolved by knowledge*.

The process of development from the Gospel of Truth to the latter citation is indicated by the fact that the whole "system" (σύστασις) springs from the ignorance which is dissolved by knowledge. The elliptic version of the formula in the Gospel of Truth certainly does not have a "system" in mind but points merely to the knowledge of one's true existence in the Father as the way in which salvation is appropriated. Moreover, it is stated specifically that this kind of knowledge is the antithesis of forgetfulness and deficiency. Since knowledge and forgetfulness cannot exist together, the presence of one implies the abolition of the other. This is the "good news" - that man's longing for the discovery of salvation will no longer be hindered by his own forgetfulness because this limitation has been overcome by the knowledge of man's true existence in the Father which the Saviour brings. This is the gist of the revelation of the truth which is the gospel.

---

[82] H. Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, 1. Band (1934), S. 206, Bemerk. 2, und S. 374-375; 2. Band (1954), S. 162-163; *Gnostic Religion* (1958), pp. 174-179; and *Gnom.*, 32 (1960), 329-335, was the first to recognize the formula (in the quotation of Irenaeus and in the Gospel of Truth) as a key to the interpretation of Valentinian doctrine. In 1934 he centered his entire understanding of Valentinus around the one occurrence of the formula in the treatise of Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.*, I, 21,4). Upon examining the Gospel of Truth in 1960, his earlier emphasis was proven correct by finding the same Valentinian formula twice in the newly discovered document (*Ev. Ver.*, p. 18,7-11; p. 24,28-32). This is convincing evidence for the Valentinian character of the Gospel of Truth.

The remainder of the passage (p. 18,12-21) deals with the effect of the gospel upon man. Although its origin with the Father and its communication to man by means of the Son remain a "hidden mystery" (μυστήριον) (p. 18,15; cf. p. 38,18-19), its effect upon man can be seen in no uncertain terms. Man comes to know himself as being "perfect" (ϪⲎⲔ) in the sense of attaining his full potentiality (p. 18,14; cf. Phil. 3:13 and 15). The existential awareness of this true existence which God intends for him is possible because the gospel brings light to his former state of darkness and knowledge to his former state of forgetfulness (p. 18,15-18). Man comes to know that the origin of his existence is in the Father because the "way" (ⲘⲀⲈⲒⲦ) (p. 18,19 and 20; p. 31,29; cf. p. 20,21-22) has been pointed out by Jesus Christ in the "truth" (ⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲘ·ⲎⲈ) which is the gospel (p. 18,20; cf. John 14:6).

Thus far, the gospel is understood as "joy" which is the assurance of salvation, as "hope" which is the object of salvation, and as "knowledge" which is the appropriation of salvation. The fourth passage is a picture of the gospel as "rest" (Ⲙ̄ⲦⲀⲚ) which is the goal of salvation.

p. 33,35 He (= the Father) has knowledge of what
is yours, so that you may find your rest
in them. For (γάρ) from the
fruits one has knowledge of
what is yours. For the children of the Father
p. 34,1 are his fragrance since
they are from the grace of His
countenance. For this reason the Father loves
His fragrance and makes it manifest
5 in every place. And if it (= the fragrance) be mixed
with matter (ὕλη), He (= the Father) gives His fragrance
to the light, and in His silence
He (= the Father) causes it (= the fragrance) to
rise above every form
and every sound. For (γάρ) it is not the ears which
10 smell the fragrance, but (ἀλλά) ...
the spirit (πνεῦμα) which has
the (sense of) smelling, and it (= the spirit) draws
it (= the fragrance)
to itself and plunges down into
the fragrance of the Father. He (= the Father) brings
it (safe) to harbor
15 and receives it unto the place
from whence it came forth
in the original fragrance which has become
cold. It is one of a psychic (ψυχικόν)
mold (πλάσμα), being
20 like cold water
which has become deficient (?), and it is on loose
earth (lit. earth that is not firm), of which
those who see it think that
it is (solid) ground. Afterwards, it dissolved
25 again. If a breath
draws it, it becomes warm.
Therefore, the cold fragrances are the result of the
separation.
For this reason God (?) came,
abolished the separation,
30 and brought the warm fulness (πλήρωμα)
of love (ἀγάπη), in order that
the coldness might not again come into existence,
but (ἀλλά) (in order that) the unity of
perfect thought might be (realized).
35 This (is) the word (λόγος) of the "glad tidings"
(= gospel)
concerning the coming of fulness (πλήρωμα) for those
who are awaiting
p. 35,1 the salvation which comes
from above.

When man comes to know that the true origin of his existence is in the Father (p. 33,32), then he "finds rest" (Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈⲦⲚ̄Ⲙ̄ⲦⲀⲚ) (p. 33,36) in the reabsorption of his true self into the divine (p. 33,35-39). Since the completion of salvation is slightly different for the true Gnostics (= "pneumatics") and the potential Gnostics (= "psychics"), a long passage follows on the "fragrance" (ⲤⲦⲀⲈⲒ) of the Father in which the origin of their respective natures is explained (p. 33,39 - p. 34,34; cf. 2 Cor. 2:14-16). The fragrance of the Father is manifested everywhere with the result that some of it is mixed with "matter" (ὕλη) and some of it remains free as "spirit" (πνεῦμα) (p. 34,4-12). That which is mixed with matter "grows cold" (ⲀⲢϢ̄ = ψύχει) from the loss of divine love and becomes a "psychic" (ψυχικόν) mold (p. 34,17-19).[83] The origin of the "psychic man" is thus traced to a cooling-off process of an original "spiritual" condition due to the loss of divine love and the mixture with matter. Moreover, this psychic mold is like cold water that has become deficient because it is on "loose earth" (ⲞⲨⲔⲀϨ ⲈϤⲦⲎⲔ ⲈⲚ) which allows the cold water to evaporate (p. 34,20-25). Therefore, the separation of "soul" (= psychic mold) and "body" (= loose earth) is described as a cold fragrance from below which is drawn in by a warm breath (= the fulness of love) from above (p. 34,25-34). The "rest" is, therefore, "the unity of perfect thought" (ⲦⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲞⲨⲈⲈⲒ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲧϫⲏⲕ (p. 34,33-34) which is realized when those who are "spiritual" return to their heavenly origin and when those who are "psychic" are separated from matter. Then the climax comes in the closing sentence.

---

[83] Note the play on words in the Greek between ψῦχος ("cold") and ψυχικός ("psychic"). It is quite interesting that Origen (*De Principiis*, II, 8) uses the same *Wortspiel* and gives a similar explanation for the origin of the soul: "We must ask whether perhaps even the word 'soul', which in Greek is ψυχή, was not formed from ψύχεσθαι with the idea of growing cold after having been in a diviner and better state, and whether it was not derived from thence because the soul seems to have grown cold by the loss of its first natural and divine warmth." The writer is indebted to Hans Jonas for this reference. Cf. H. Jonas, "Origines' ΠΕΡΙ ΑΡΧΩΝ - ein System patristischer Gnosis," *T. Z. Bas.*, 4 (1948), 101-119, and "Die origenistische Spekulation und die Mystik," *T. Z. Bas.*, 5 (1949), 24-45.

> This is the word (= message) of the "glad tidings" (ϣⲙ ⲛⲟⲩϥⲉ) (= gospel) concerning the coming of fulness for those who are awaiting the salvation which comes from above (p. 34,35 - p. 35,2).

Upon finding the completion of salvation in the return of the self to its heavenly origin, man is able to find rest in the Father, knowing that this is indeed "the Rest" (p. 24,20).

It is the understanding of the "gospel" as the truth concerning the good news which enables man to find joy, hope, knowledge, and rest which is the way of salvation for the Gnostic. Upon viewing the document as a whole, it becomes clear that these four aspects of salvation provide the framework for a comprehensive treatment of the Gnostic understanding of soteriology. "Joy" is possible because man overcomes his enslavement to the forces of Error, thus calling for a consideration of the predicament of man. "Hope" can be experienced because of the appearance of the Saviour as the divine messenger from the Father, thus calling for a discussion of the redemptive work of Christ. "Knowledge" is the way in which salvation is appropriated by man and "Rest" is the resultant state of eternal life in which the self is absorbed into the divine, pointing to the necessity of discussing the appropriation of eternal life. A comparison of this Gnostic way of salvation with the soteriology of the Gospel of John will reveal some further similarities of terminology between the two documents, but it will also expose their major differences in thought.

I. THE PREDICAMENT OF MAN

The contrast between the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth is quite obvious with respect to the predicament of man. For John the predicament is sin which separates man from God; for the Gnostic writer it is Error which deceives man concerning the true origin of his existence in the Father.

(1) Rebellion Against God. The Johannine interpretation of what it is in man's situation that makes salvation necessary is basically a matter of moral perversion which produces a condition of rebellion against God. The basic problem is one of sin which expresses itself in unbelief.

(a) Sin. John uses the term "sin" (ἁμαρτία) both for the principle of sin and for the practice of sinful acts.[84] It occurs fourteen times in the singular to express the principle or power of sin (John 1:29; [8:3]; 8:21, 34, and 46; 9:41; 15:22 and 24; 19:8-9; 19:11). In this abstract sense sin is the corruption of the nature of man which makes fellowship with God impossible. It is the self-assertion of the finite in violation of the limits which guide the harmonious fulfilment of the idea of its being. This is a predicament because man is more or less unaware of the actual trouble and is unable to help himself. As long as his life is lived in rebellion against God, Jesus can only say, "You will die in your *sin*" (ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ὑμῶν ἀποθανεῖσθε)

---

[84] W. Grundmann, "Sin" in *Bible Key Words*, Vol. I, Part 3 (1951), 64-89, esp. 71-75. Cf. G. B. Stevens, *op. cit.*, pp. 127-155; J. E. Thomas, *The Problem of Sin in the New Testament* (London: A. and C. Black, 1927), pp. 71-79; K. G. Kuhn, "πειρασμός, ἁμαρτία, σάρξ im Neuen Testament," *Z. Th. K.*, 49 (1952), 200-222; Jakob Hass, *Die Stellung Jesu zu Sünde und Sünder nach den vier Evangelien* (Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1953); C. R. Smith, *The Bible Doctrine of Sin and of the Ways of God with Sinners* (London: Epworth Press, 1953); and E. K. Lee, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-127.

(John 8:21). The term also occurs four times in the plural to designate the practice of sinful acts (John 8:24; 9:34; 20:23). John thinks of "sin" as the principle or quality of life which expresses itself in various evil thoughts, unkind words, and wrong deeds. In this respect Jesus says, "You will die in your sins" (ἀποθανεῖσθε ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν) (John 8:24). Thus, the practice of specific sins is in itself evidence of bondage to the power of sin. The verb ἁμαρτάνειν is used four times in the same twofold sense. As the present imperative ἁμάρτανε (John 5:14; [8:11]) it means "to sin habitually" or "to live a sinful life." As the aorist indicative ἥμαρτεν (John 9:2-3) it means "to commit an act of sin." Whether John is speaking of the power of "sin" or the practice of "sins," he realizes that the basic problem is the self-assertion of the finite against the infinite. This is not a matter of metaphysics in which evil exists of necessity in the nature of things but of moral perversion in which evil comes into existence in the self-assertion of man's will in rebellion against God.

The understanding of sin as the corruption of man's nature is clearly implied in the idea of slavery and in the idea of generation from the Devil. The interpretation of sin as "slavery" is found in the words of Jesus: "Truly, truly, I say to you, Everyone who commits sin is a slave to sin" (δοῦλος τῆς ἁμαρτίας) (John 8:34). The use of the present participle ὁ ποιῶν (= one who commits) does not refer to the actual performance of sinful acts but to living a life of sin in selfish isolation from God. The sinful folly of life without Christ becomes a form of slavery in which man no longer has control over his actions. John does not say that the soul is a slave to the body but that the man who commits sin is himself body and soul the slave of sin. The interpretation of sin as "generation from the Devil" means that sin not only rules the man but that the Devil also rules him. This is what Jesus means when he says: "*You are of your father the Devil* (ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστέ), and your will is to do your father's desires" (John 8:44). The sinful man is not born of God but of the Devil (John 8:47). Because of his generation from the Devil, he deliberately chooses as his own the feelings and passions which belong to his father. The implication is that human sinfulness in the world is an expression of moral kinship with the Devil (cf. 1 John 3:8 and 10). Therefore, it is not possible for man to be neutral. Without Christ he is a slave of sin and a child of the Devil who is guilty of disobedience and rebellion, and his sin separates him from God (cf. John 9:31).

(b) Unbelief. In the Fourth Gospel sin expresses itself in the form of unbelief.[85] The Holy Spirit must convict the world in respect of sin "because *they do not believe* (οὐ πιστεύουσιν) on me" (John 16:9; cf. John 3:12 and 18: 4:48; 5:38 and 47; 6:36 and 64; 8:24 and 45-46; 9:18; 10:25-26 and 37-38). Although some of the Jews believed (John 11:45; 12:42), John views the attitude of the Jews who do not believe as the epitome of the opposition of the world to Christ (John 12:37 and 39;

---

[85] This unbelief is man's inner rejection of Christ which can be detected outwardly in a life of "falsehood" (ἀδικία) (John 7:18). The outward expression of sin is specifically referred to in the First Epistle of John as "lawlessness" (ἀνομία) (1 John 3:4) and "unrighteousness" (ἀδικία) (1 John 5:17), i.e. in every violation of the moral law and in every wrong-doing of any kind. W. Grundmann, "Sin" in *Bible Key Words* (1951), p. 72, clearly describes the situation in which man finds himself: "Sin is behaviour which runs counter to the divine ordinance, which corresponds to what is right; so is both ἀνομία and ἀδικία , the contradiction both of what is right and of the will of God. It is in factthe product of the contradiction of God, the outcome of men's godlessness, materialized in unfriendly action. This establishes its universality. Man is not neutral; he is guilty, and his sin separates him from God (see John 9:31)." Cf. B. F. Westcott, *The Epistles of St. John, The Greek Text with Notes and Essays* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1955), pp. 37-40.

cf. John 15:22 and 24). The Jews are therefore representatives of the darkness of the world (John 3:19), not because the light has not shone upon them but because they have not apprehended it (John 1:5; cf. John 1:10). The life which results from unbelief is figuratively described as "walking in darkness" (John 8:12; 12:35) or "abiding in darkness" (John 12:46). Therefore, one of the functions of the Holy Spirit is to "convict the world in respect of sin" (περὶ ἁμαρτίας) (John 16:8-9), i.e. to make the person who does not believe on Christ conscious of his rebellious self-assertion against God.

It is somewhat surprising that the verb "to sin" (ⲣ̄ⲛⲁⲃⲓ) occurs twice in the Gospel of Truth (p. 32,37; p. 35,26).[86] It appears once in connection with "error" when the Gnostic is exhorted to "speak concerning the truth to those who seek it and of knowledge to those who have sinned (ⲛⲛⲉⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲣ̄ⲛⲁⲃⲓ) in their error" (p. 32,35-37). In agreement with the Biblical understanding of "error" (πλάνη) (e.g. 2 Pet. 2:18; 3:17) the term is used here as a manifestation of sin in wandering or roaming from the path of truth. The verb "to sin" occurs again in connection with "repentance."

> p. 35,22 For (γάρ) this return (ⲡⲓⲧⲁⲥⲧⲟ) is
> called "repentance" (μετάνοια).
> For this reason Imperishability (= Christ)
> breathed forth (and) followed after him who
> had sinned (ⲡⲉⲧⲁϥⲣ̄ⲛⲁⲃⲓ), in order that he
> might find
> 27 rest.

In contrast to the Biblical understanding of "repentance" as turning away from sin (e.g. 2 Pet. 3:9) the Gnostic idea is that of returning to the

---

[86] The preliminary report of W. C. van Unnik (in F. L. Cross, op. cit., p. 126) avoids the use of the term "Harmartiology" since the word "sin" is not mentioned in the Gospel of Truth. The same oversight is made again when he says that "in this 'gospel' ... sin is not even mentioned" (W. C. van Unnik, Gnostic Writings, p. 68).

Father (p. 19,5; p. 21,7; p. 24,6; p. 35,21; p. 36,15; p. 41,7; cf. p. 21,20; p. 30,13; p. 35,21-22). In both passages the Gnostic use of the verb "to sin" is not an expression of the idea of rebellion against God but of forgetfulness of man's origin in the Father. For the Gnostic writer sin is not based on man's disobedience to God but on a loss of knowledge about man's origin and destiny in God. For this reason the Gospel of Truth finds the true basis of selfhood in the power of human thinking and completely disregards the human responsibility for sin and guilt. Such an obvious reinterpretation of the Johannine use of ἁμαρτάνειν again makes it clear that a mere comparison of terminology is not an adequate method for interpreting the use of the Fourth Gospel in the Gospel of Truth. This difference in meaning with respect to the understanding of "sin" is also symptomatic of a similar difference in the understanding of Error.

(2) Forgetfulness of Man's Origin. The Gnostic interpretation of man's essential wrongness is basically a problem of the intellect in which a condition of forgetfulness keeps man from knowing the true origin of his existence in the Father. The basic problem is one of Error which expresses itself in ignorance.

(a) Error. The author of the Gospel of Truth uses the term "Error" (ⲡⲗⲁⲛⲏ) in two distinct ways. It occurs nine times as the hypostasized appellative for the antagonistic principle of the universe which wavers between poetic personification and personal independence (p. 17,15, 29, and 36; p. 18,22; p. 22,21 and 24; p. 26,19 and 26; p. 35,18). In this connection the term literally means "wandering from the way" and then metaphysically comes to mean "Error" as opposed to "Truth." It also occurs twice as a simple appellative in the sense of a concrete deviation from that which is right or correct (p. 31,25; p. 32,37). This deviation is described as "going astray in error" (ⲚⲈⲨⲤⲀⲢⲘ̄ Ⲛ̄ϨⲢⲎⲒ̈ ϨⲚ̄ ϮⲠⲖⲀⲚⲎ) (p. 31,24-25) or "sinning in their error" (Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀⲨⲢ̄ⲚⲀⲂⲒ Ⲛ̄ϨⲢⲎⲒ̈ ϨⲚ̄ ⲦⲞⲨⲠⲖⲀⲚⲎ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲰⲦⲚ̄) (p. 32,37-38). The use of the term in this sense reflects the influence of the New Testament, e.g. "bringing a sinner back from the error of his way" (ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ) (James 5:20; cf. Rom. 1:27; Eph. 4:14; 1 Thess. 2:3; 2 Thess. 2:11; Jude 11). Just as the Gospel of John makes a distinction between the principle of sin and the practice of sin, the Gospel of Truth contrasts the metaphysical idea of wandering with its practical expression in concrete acts of error.

The Gnostic understanding of πλάνη presupposes the struggle in the world of invisible realities between Truth and Error. This explains the origin of evil as an expression of incompleteness resulting from ignorance of the Father (p. 17,15, 29, and 36). Having used the idea of Error in opposition to Truth to explain the origin of evil, Error is then placed in opposition to Christ as the ruler of the unreal world in which man is unable to know the origin of his existence.

p. 22,13 He who has knowledge in
this manner perceives whence he came
15 and whither he is going.
He perceives as one
who has been drunk (and) becomes sober (lit. has turned from his drunkenness).
When he had returned to his own self,
he set in order those things
20 which are his own. He (= Jesus) brought many back
from Error (πλάνη). He went
before them to their own places,
from which they had departed
when they had received Error (πλάνη)
25 on account of the depth (βάθος) of Him who
surrounds every place, whereas there is nothing
which surrounds Him. It was a great
wonder that they were in the Father
without knowing Him and that they were

30 able to come out (from the Father) alone
(= without assistance)
since (ἐπειδή) they were not able to
grasp (lit. receive) (Him) for themselves and
to know the One
in whom they were. For (γάρ)
His will had not come forth from Him thus.
35 For (γάρ) He revealed it (= His will) (to the world)
as knowledge and with it
37 were associated its emanations.

Error is not only the cosmic force which stands in opposition to the Truth, but it is also personified in the form of the "Devil" (διάβολος) (p. 33,20). In this capacity Error proceeds to blur man's sense of reality by keeping him in a state of drunkenness in which he does not know his true self. Like the adversary of Christ in the New Testament, Error relates himself to man as "one who deceives" (ὁ πλανῶν) (Rev. 20:10). In the Gospel of Truth this work of deception is undone by Jesus who "brought many back from Error" (πλάνη) (p. 22,20-21), i.e. caused many to rise above the mistaken view of the human origin of their existence apart from the Father which had been implanted in them by Error. The opposition between Error and Jesus is inevitable since Jesus is the agent by which God makes himself known to man. God is described as "the Depth (βάθος) who surrounds every place" (ⲁⲙⲉⲓⲧ ⲛⲓⲙ) (p. 22,25-26), i.e. the One who is the true source of existence for every creature of the universe. It is striking that "the Depth (βάθος) of the Father expanded (lit. became great) and the thought of Error (πλάνη) was not with Him" (p. 35,15-18). Instead, Error enticed the "Aeons" (αἰών) (p. 23,1) to leave "their own places" (ⲛⲓⲙⲁⲉⲓⲧ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ) (p. 22,22-23) in relation to the Father and to find the meaning of their existence in themselves. The Father reacted by revealing Christ as a "cosmic redeemer" who went to the Aeons in their own places and communicated to them the "knowledge" (ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ) (p. 22,36) of their true existence in the Father. Just as Error has "its emanations" (ⲛ̄ⲉⲥϯⲏ) (p. 26,25), Truth has "its emanations" (ⲛⲓϯⲏ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲥ) (p. 26,29) and knowledge is associated with "its emanations" (ⲛⲓϯⲏ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲧⲥ̄) (p. 22,37). The heavenly beings associated with "Truth" and "knowledge" are also called "the emanations from the Father" (ⲛⲓϯⲏ ⲛⲧⲛ̄ ⲡⲓⲱⲧ) (p. 41,14-15) because "in all His emanations (ⲛⲉϥϯⲏ) their root is in Him who caused them all to grow forth from Himself" (p. 41,16-19).

By starting with the one supreme source of all things called "the Depth" (p. 22,25), the relationship of this perfect God with imperfect matter is explained by the origin of "Error" (p. 17,14-17). The ensuing cosmological drama concerns the emanations of Error who leave their places in relation to the Father, the appearance of Christ who communicates the basis of true existence, and the emanations of Truth and knowledge who discover the root of their existence in the Father. This understanding of redemption in the invisible world is in reality an ideal representation of the way of salvation for man in the visible world. The three classes of man on earth are conversely only shadowy representations of the real divisions between the emanations in the invisible world. The emanations of Error are the ideal form of the "hylics" on earth who remain ignorant of the Father. The emanations of Truth and knowledge are the ideal form of the "penumatics" on earth who are predestined to know the true origin of their existence in the Father. The remainder are the "psychics" who are described as "those of the middle" (p. 17,34-35). The attempt of Error "to take them captive" (p: 17,35) is counterbalanced by the appearance of Christ which communicates the knowledge and Truth of the Father (p. 26,15-32).

The inspiration for this metaphysical understanding of "Error" is not derived from the Fourth Gospel but from Plato's theory of ideas.[87] The Gnostic writer is indebted to Plato for his belief in eternal, unchanging universal absolutes which are independent of the world of phenomena. His understanding of cosmology presupposes the teaching of the *Timaeus* that the Ideas are the pattern or model which the Maker has in view when he fashions the universe. The threefold division of man in the Gospel of Truth is also foreshadowed in Plato's categories of the eternal Forms, the world-soul, and the sensible world (*Tim.*, 34B3 - C4). The existence assigned to Forms is indivisible and unchanging; that assigned to the physical bodies is divisible and changing; that ascribed to the world-soul is in both respects intermediate. In the Gospel of Truth the "pneumatics" bear a resemblance to the eternal Forms; the "psychics" to the intermediate world-soul; and the "hylics" to the material body. Plato teaches that the attainment of true existence in the world of Forms is accomplished only in the struggle with "Error," both in a metaphysical and in a concrete sense. On the one hand, Socrates describes the difficulty of his search for wisdom by recounting the tale of his "wandering" (πλάνη) (*Apol.*, 20E and 22A). Plato illustrates this usage with his description of the upward ascent of life in the famous analogy of the Chariot (*Phaedrus*, 246A6 - 257). On the other hand, Plato insists that the soul, by departing to the invisible world, is released from the "error and folly" (πλάνη καὶ ἄνοια) of men (*Phaedo*, 81A). It is no longer deceived by the belief that "truth"

---

[87] H. Braun, πλανάω, πλάνη in G. Kittel's *T. W. N. T.*, 6 (1959), 230-254; insbes. 233-234. Cf. F. MacDonald Cornford, *Plato's Cosmology: The Timaeus of Plato Translated with a Running Commentary* (London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1937); David Ross, *Plato's Theory of Ideas* (Oxford: Clarenden Press, 1951), pp. 120-130, and John Wild, *Plato's Theory of Man: An Introduction to the Realistic Philosophy of Culture* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1946), pp. 148-158 and 174-204.

(ἀλήθεια) exists only in a bodily form which man must touch and see and taste (Phaedo, 81B). Having accepted the Platonic separation between the imperfect visible world of matter and the perfect invisible world of ideas, the author of the Gospel of Truth presents the original conflict in the world of ideas (which is brought about by the unconscious "wandering" of Error in search of the equivalent of Truth) as the prototype for the corrupting of the nature of man on earth. The "hylics" are, therefore, the ones who wander about in a state of ignorance of the Father and are material by nature without any hope of salvation.

(b) Ignorance. According to the Gospel of Truth, Error expresses itself in ignorance. In contrast to the Johannine teaching concerning those who "do not believe" (οὐ πιστεύουσιν) on Christ (John 16:9), the Gnostic writer speaks of "those who have not known" (Ⲛ̄ⲚⲈⲒ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀϨⲢ̄ ⲀⲦⲤⲞⲨⲰⲚ) the Father (p. 16,39 - p. 17,1). Unlike John, the Gnostic teaching is not limited to the negative use of the verb "to know" but also includes the noun "ignorance" (ⲀⲦⲤⲞⲨⲰⲚ) (p. 17,10; p. 21,15, 31, and 34-35; p. 24,33-34 and 36; p. 27,33; p. 29,34; p. 30,9; p. 31,31). The use of the α - privative in ⲀⲦⲤⲞⲨⲰⲚ which literally means "not-knowing" immediately calls to mind the New Testament term ἄ-γνοια (e.g. Acts 3:17; 17:30; Eph. 4:18; 1 Pet. 1:14). The fact that man is a victim of Error is confirmed by his ignorance of the Father. In this condition his existence is one of "terror" (ⲞⲨⲚⲞⲨϢⲠ̄) (p. 17,11; cf. p. 17,10 and 23-24) and "fear" (ⲞⲨϨⲢ̄ⲦⲈ) (p. 17,10-11; cf. p. 17,33; p. 20,36; p. 28,29; p. 29,2; John 7:13; 19:38; 20:19) which is compared with roaming aimlessly in a dense "fog" (ϨⲖⲀⲤⲦⲚ̄) (p. 17,12; cf. p. 17,31). It is an existence which "has a deficiency" (ϤϢⲀⲀⲦ) (p. 21,15; cf. John 2:3) and makes a person into "a creature of forgetfulness" (ⲟⲩⲡⲗⲁⲥⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲧⲃ̄ϣⲉ) (p. 21,35-36; cf. p. 17,24-25). Apart from the appearance of Christ which communicates the knowledge of man's true existence in the Father, man is doomed to remain in "darkness" (ⲕⲉⲕⲉⲓ) (p. 24,37; cf. John 1:5; 3:19; 6:17; 8:12; 12:35 and 46; 20:1) as if he were "asleep" (ⲛ̄ⲕⲁⲧⲕⲉ) (p. 30,7; cf. p. 33,7-8; John 11:11 and 12) or as if he were "drunk" (ϯϩⲉ) (p. 22,17; cf. John 2:10). All of these terms - terror, fear, fog,deficiency, forgetfulness, darkness, sleep, and drunkenness - describe the predicament of man who is ignorant of the Father as a result of the work of Error.

It is remarkable that both the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth use the term "darkness" to describe the predicament of man. The term occurs in the Fourth Gospel as σκότος (John 3:19) and σκοτία (John 1:5; 8:12; 12:35 and 46). It occurs in the Gnostic writing only as ⲕⲉⲕⲉⲓ (p. 18,17, p. 24,37; p. 25,17-18). The contrast in meaning, however, is indicative of the basic difference between the two documents. In John "darkness" has an ethical quality of moral perversity which manifests itself in "deeds which are evil" (John 3:19). In the Gospel of Truth "darkness" is merely a state of mind which is void of the illuminating knowledge of one's true existence in the Father. In other words, for the Gnostic writer it is a matter of forgetfulness which is basically a problem of the intellect. In this case a superficial similarity in terminology is completely overshadowed by a significant difference in thought. The same difference is also reflected in the basic contrast between man's enslavement to the power of sin which expresses itself in unbelief and man's envolvement with the principle of Error which expresses itself in ignorance. Because the predicament of man is obviously the negative aspect of salvation, it is now fitting to turn to the positive aspect which is reflected in the redemptive work of Christ.

II. THE REDEMPTIVE WORK OF CHRIST

The centrality of Christ in both documents calls for a consideration of the part that he plays in delivering man from the predicament in which he finds himself. In the Gospel of John the emphasis is upon the work of Christ as an earthly Saviour; in the Gospel of Truth the work of Christ is presented as that of a heavenly messenger.

(1) Earthly Saviour. The heart of Johannine theology is the way in which God works out his redemptive purpose for mankind in the life of Jesus Christ. The entire doctrine is based on the fact that Jesus is the earthly Saviour whose life is rooted in history.[88] This is expressed in the Johannine view of the mission of Christ as the Saviour who is sent by the Father as a light shining in the world of darkness. It is also apparent in the presentation of the ministry of Christ as a man of flesh and blood who reveals the purpose of God in "signs" and "sayings." The climax of his mission and ministry is reached in the interpretation of the passion of Christ as the defeat of Satan, the glorification of the Son, and the fulfilment of the divine purpose. This is John's way of affirming

---

[88] J. Lachowski, The Concept of Redemption According to the Gospel of St. John (Romae: Pontificum Athenaeum Angelicum de Urbe, 1958). Cf. G. B. Stevens, op. cit., pp. 156-188; R. H. Strachan, The Fourth Evangelist: Dramatist or Historian? (London: Hodder and Stroughton, 1925); Otto A. Piper, God in History (New York: Macmillan Co., 1939); C. Ryder Smith, The Bible Doctrine of Salvation: A Study of the Atonement (London: Epworth Press, 1941), pp. 284-306; H. Wheeler Robinson, Redemption and Revelation in the Actuality of History (London: Nisbet and Co., 1942); W. Grossouw, Revelation and Redemption: A Sketch of the Theology of St. John (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1955); W. Herberg, "Biblical Faith as Heilsgeschichte: The Meaning of Redemptive History in Human Existence," Chr. Schol., 39 (1956), 25-31; and Eric C. Rust, Salvation History (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1963).

that the redemptive work of Christ is in reality the actualization and fulfilment of God's purpose in history.

(a) The Mission of Christ. In the Fourth Gospel the mission of Christ hinges on his role as the Saviour. John refers to Christ as "the Saviour of the world" (ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου) (John 4:42) and describes his mission as bringing "the salvation" (ἡ σωτηρία) (John 4:22) which had been long-expected by the Jews in order that all mankind "might be saved" (σωθῇ) (John 3:17). The four passages in which the verb σώζειν occurs with respect to the mission of Christ are particularly significant (John 3:17; 5:34; 10:9; 12:47). The verb occurs in the active voice when Jesus says, "I did not come to judge the world but *to save the world*" (ἵνα σώσω τὸν κόσμον) (John 12:47; cf. John 4:42). Here "the world" stands for mankind in general and assumes that all men stand condemned before God because of sin and guilt (cf. John 3:17; 7:7; 14:17; 16:8). Thus it is the world which is the scene of the redemptive work of Christ (John 1:10), and his mission is grounded in the love of God for the world (John 3:16). In the other three passages the verb σώζειν occurs in the passive voice.

> For God sent the Son into the world, not to condemn the world, but *that the world might be saved* (ἵνα σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος) through him. ... Not that the testimony which I receive is from man, but I say this *that you may be saved* (ἵνα ὑμεῖς σωθῆτε). ... I am the door; if any one enters by me, *he will be saved* (σωθησεται) and will go *in and out and find* pasture (John 3:17; 5:34; 10:9).

Since the divine purpose has no limitations, the mission of Christ includes all mankind (John 3:17). Jesus also points out the validity of the witness of John the Baptist (even though he does not depend upon it) since it may cause some of the Jews to believe on him (John 5:34). The

"I am" saying of Jesus indicates the security and sustenance which comes to the believer when he is delivered from the bondage of sin (John 10:9). Therefore, the Johannine solution for the predicament of man is the salvation that "the Saviour" brings into the world.

Because the mission of Christ is an expression of the redemptive purpose of God, John teaches that the Saviour is "one who has been sent" (ἀπόστολος) from the Father (John 13:16). The term ἀπόστολος is not used here in the technical sense of "apostle" but as a synonym for the verbs ἀποστέλλειν and πέμπειν. The verb ἀποστέλλειν occurs twenty-eight times, of which seventeen refer to the sending of the Son from the Father into the world (e.g. John 3:17 and 34). It designates the kind of sending in which the person sent is a delegate with transferred authority from the one who sends him. The root-meaning of the verb πέμπειν which occurs thirty-two times has reference to the simple relation between the sender and the one who is sent (e.g. John 4:34; 5:23), but the term also conveys the thought of a definite mission which is carried out by an envoy.

> And the Father who sent me (ὁ πέμψας με) has Himself borne witness to me. His voice you have never heard, his form you have never seen; and you do not have his word abiding in you, for you do not believe him whom he has sent (ἀπέστειλεν). . . . You know me, and you know where I come from? But I have not come of my own accord; he who sends me (ὁ πέμψας με) is true, and him you do not know. I know him, for I come from him, and he sent (ἀπέστειλεν) me (John. 5:37-38; 7:28-29).

In these two passages both verbs are used synonymously to show that the witness of the Father is granted to those who believe on the Son and that knowledge of the Father is granted to those who know the Son. Because the Son is the Father's envoy, it is actually the Father that is encountered in the mission of Christ. The emphasis is not on the theological relationship between the Father and the Son, which is implied by the process of sending, as much as on the purpose of the mission of Christ which is a reflection of the divine purpose of the Father (John 5:36; 6:29). Just as the Father sends the Son, the Son also sends his disciples into the world, so that the purpose of God may continue to be carried out in them and through them (John 17:18; 20:21).

Since John understands "the world" as the realm of darkness (John 1:5a), it is natural that the mission of Christ should also be described as the shining of light in the darkness (John 1:9; 3:19; 12:46). Whereas the verb "to illumine" (φωτίζειν) (John 1:9) is used only once, the term "light" (φῶς) is used twenty-three times with reference to Jesus. For example, he is "the light of the world" (τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου) (John 8:12a; 9:5; 11:9), "the light of life" (τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς) (John 8:12b), and "the light of men" (τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων) (John 1:4). The idea of conflict between light and darkness is best expressed in the words of the Prologue: "The light (τὸ φῶς) shines in the darkness, and the darkness (ἡ σκοτία) has not overcome it" (John 1:5). The light does not simply appear. It "shines" (φαίνει) and invades the realm of darkness, and the darkness "has not overcome it" (οὐ κατέλαβεν). The verb καταλαμβάνειν means "to seize" either in the sense of "overcoming" or in the sense of "grasping with the mind, apprehending." Here it seems that both meanings are intended since the darkness is not able to understand or to put out the light. Although the conflict between light and darkness is set forth in the Prologue as a cosmological principle, it is used repeatedly in the

Fourth Gospel with reference to the mission of Christ in the world.

> The light (τὸ φῶς) is with you for a little longer. Walk while you have the light (τὸ φῶς), lest the darkness overtake you; he who walks in darkness does not know where he goes. While you have the light (τὸ φῶς), believe in the light (εἰς τὸ φῶς), that you may become sons of light. ... I have come as light (φῶς) into the world, that whosoever believes in me may not remain in darkness (John 12:35-36 and 46).

In other words, the normal state of man without Christ is one of darkness, but the believer is delivered from the darkness of the world by the one who is "the true light" (τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν) (John 1:9). The fact that light is intimately connected with dispersing darkness makes it a vivid metaphor for the redemptive work of Christ. Therefore, the references to Christ as "the Saviour of the world" (John 4:42) and "the light of the world" (John 8:12; 9:5; 11:9) mean essentially the same thing. In both cases they describe a soteriological function rather than a cosmological status.

(b) The Ministry of Christ. John presents the ministry of Christ as a man of flesh and blood revealing the purpose of God in "signs" and "sayings." The entire life of Christ on this earth is summarized in the great Johannine paradox: "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us" (John 1:14), i.e. the divine *Logos* came to earth as a human being who took up a temporary residence in our midst. The paradox of the Incarnation is expressed in the statements "the Word was God" (θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος) (John 1:1) and "the Word became flesh" (ὁ λόγος σάρξ ἐγένετο) (John 1:14). It is in the earthly ministry of Christ that eternity and time, the divine and the human, are brought into perfect harmony. The paradox is further expressed in the statements "he was with God" (ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν) (John 1:1) and "he dwelt among us" (ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν) (John 1:14). It is in the historical life of Christ that the divine existence is brought into vital connection with human life. The term σάρξ emphasizes the fact that the existence of Christ on this earth is truly human and is subject to all the conditions of human existence, even though he never ceases to be God. It is significant that John 1:14 uses the term "flesh" instead of "body," thereby avoiding the possibility of interpreting the earthly life of Christ in a purely spiritual sense. The phrase ὁ λόγος σάρξ ἐγένετο is unique in the Fourth Gospel and affirms the mysterious reconciliation of the finite and the infinite in the earthly ministry of Jesus. Although the paradox remains a mystery, it is clear that σάρξ describes the human nature of Christ in its totality from the standpoint of his earthly life (cf. John 6:51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, and 63). Elsewhere the term is used to characterize human nature in general (John 1:13; 3:6; 8:15; 17:2). In the Fourth Gospel the related term σῶμα is used only in connection with the dead body of Jesus (John 2:21; 19:31, 38, and 40; 20:12).

Having established the fact that the Logos is very much involved in the historical situation of man here on this earth, John unfolds the ministryof Christ in terms of his revelation of the purpose of God in "signs" and "sayings" which demonstrate the nature of what God is attempting to accomplish in history (John 20:30-31). For John these "signs" (σημεῖα) which manifest the glory of God are more than ordinary events, and these "sayings" which begin with the designation "I am" (ἐγώ εἰμι) are more than ordinary words. The term σημεῖον signifies a historical fact that points beyond itself to the purpose of God. Eduard Schweizer expresses it well when he says,

> In its important function in the Fourth Gospel σημεῖον designates an event which is not final in itself, which ought not to be viewed by itself, but which is only meaningful as a pointer (ein Hinweis) to

something entirely different.[89]

For example, it is said that the turning of water into wine at Cana is the "first of his signs" (ἀρχὴ τῶν σημείων) (John 2:11) and that the healing of the nobleman's son is "a second sign" (δεύτερον σημεῖον) (John 4:54). By using the term "sign," the actual miracles are placed in the background since they point beyond themselves to the manifestation of the glory of God and to the fulfilment of His purpose in the life of Christ. The term is also used of healings in general (John 6:2), of the feeding of the multitude (John 6:14), and of the raising of Lazarus (John 12:18). Although only four events are specifically called "signs," several other miracles deserve the same designation since they also contain the revelation of God's purpose in history (cf. John 9:16). In this way a natural progression of seven signs provide the core of the earthly ministry of Christ in the Fourth Gospel.

1. The turning of water into wine (John 2:1-11)
2. The healing of the nobleman's son (John 4:46-54)
3. The healing of the impotent man (John 5:2-9)
4. The feeding of the multitude (John 6:4-13)
5. The walking on the water (John 6:16-21)
6. The healing of the blind man (John 9:1-7)
7. The raising of Lazarus (John 11:1-44)

This numeration of seven "signs" is balanced by the seven "sayings" of Jesus which begin with the designation "I am" (ἐγώ εἰμι).

1. I am the bread of life (John 6:35 and 48)
2. I am the light of the world (John 8:12)
3. I am the door of the sheep (John 10:7)
4. I am the good shepherd (John 10:11 and 14)
5. I am the resurrection and the life (John 11:25)
6. I am the way, the truth, and the life (John 14:6)
7. I am the true vine (John 15:1).

---

[89] E. Schweizer, *Ego Eimi . . . Die religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft und theologische Bedeutung der johanneischen Bildreden, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage des vierten Evangeliums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1939), S. 138. Cf. J. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*, Vol. I (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1928), pp. clxxvi-clxxxvi.

Just as the "signs" demonstrate the actualization of God's purpose in the miracles of Christ, the "I am" sayings affirm the actualization of God's purpose in the person of Christ. These remarkable sayings do not mean that Christ is *like* bread or light but that in the true and actual sense Christ *is* the Bread of Life, the Light of the World, etc. For this reason he satisfies the hunger of man by overcoming the darkness of sin and by becoming the way which is the truth and the life. This is not a matter of the intellectual communication of divine truth but of the purpose of God working itself out in the person of Christ.

(c) The Passion of Christ. In the Gospel of John the passion of Christ is interpreted as the defeat of Satan, the glorification of the Son, and the fulfilment of the divine purpose. The Johannine teaching concerning the defeat of Satan is contained in the three passages where he is referred to as "the ruler of this world" (ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου).

> Now is the judgment of this world, now shall *the ruler of this world* be cast out . . . . I will no longer talk much with you, for *the ruler of this world* is coming, and he has no power over me . . . . And when he (= the Holy Spirit) comes, he will convict the world...of judgment, because *the ruler of this world* is judged (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:8 and 11).

Jesus teaches his disciples that the coming crisis of the crucifixion will bring "judgment" (κρίσις) (John 12:31) upon the world, and it will be concentrated on the one who is himself the ruler of this world, i.e. the Devil (cf. Matt. 4:8-9). The implication is that the Devil and his entire kingdom will be overthrown by the voluntary death of Christ on the cross. As this decisive event draws closer, Jesus says that Satan himself is coming in the form of those whom he inspires (e.g. Judas). Christ prepares to meet his enemies with the assurance that "in me he (= Satan) has nothing" (ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔχει οὐδέν) (John 14:30b), i.e. Satan has no power over me. The same understanding of the crucifixion as a conflict between Jesus and the Devil occurs again in the description of the work and power of the Holy Spirit (John 16:8 and 11). The perfect κέκριται means that "he (= Satan) is judged" by the death of Christ on the cross. Christ is victorious and not Satan, in spite of the opposition of "the ruler of this world" who brought about the death of Christ by empowering Judas to be the instrument of his murderous activity (cf. John 8:44). Thus, the one who embodies the spirit of the world is judged at the very moment and in the very act by which he appears to have triumphed. It is on the basis of this historical event that men may be convinced by the Holy Spirit of the fact of judgment in general and, therefore, of their own judgment in particular.

The passion of Christ in the Fourth Gospel is also interpreted as the glorification of the Son. This teaching is contained in the four occurrences of the verb "to lift up" (ὑψοῦν) (John 3:14; 8:28; 12:32 and 34) and in the nine occurrences in the passive voice of the verb "to glorify" (δοξάζειν) (John 7:39; 11:4; 12:16 and 23; 13:31; 14:13; 15:8). John thinks of the cross not only as the decisive moment of the defeat of Satan (John 12:31) but also as the climactic expression of the victory of Christ (John 12:32). The fact that the death of Christ is the basic historical event of Christianity is anticipated in the Fourth Gospel when Jesus says that "the Son of Man must be lifted up" (ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ) (John 3:14; 12:34). Instead of chronologically distinguishing between the suffering and the glorification of Christ (e.g. Mark 8:31), John uses the verb ὑψοῦν to express both the elevation on the cross and the elevation on the right hand of God.

Thus, the exaltation of Christ does not take place only at the ascension but is already evident in his death on the cross. This means that the verb ὑψωθῆναι has the double meaning of "crucifixion" and "ascension" in the Fourth Gospel.[90] John also combines the two ideas of humiliation and exaltation in the use of the verb δοξάζειν which occurs a total of twenty-three times. For John the glory of Christ is not something which much await the future appearance of Christ on the clouds of heaven at the end of the world (e.g. Mark 13:26); it is already apparent in his present humiliation and death on the cross. In response to the inquiry of the Greeks, "Sir, we would see Jesus" (John 12:21), Jesus answers, "The hour has come for the Son of Man *to be glorified*" (δοξασθῆ) (John 12:23; cf. John 11:4; 14:13). The Johannine use of "the hour" (ἡ ὥρα) clearly refers to the hour of the death of Christ (cf. John 2:4; 7:30; 8:20; 12:27; 13:1; 17:1). The use of δοξασθῆναι, however, has the double meaning of "death" and "resurrection." The inquiry of the Greeks provides Jesus with the occasion to say that the necessary conditions for the proclamation of the "good news" to the Gentiles are about to be met in his death and resurrection. The gift of the Holy Spirit (John 7:39) and the proper understanding on the part of his disciples (John 12:16) must also await the same glorification. In full awareness of the meaning of Judas' departure from the upper room Jesus says,

> Now is the Son of Man *glorified* (ἐδοξάσθη),
> and in *him* God is *glorified* (ἐδοξάσθη)
> (John 13:31; cf. John 13:32; 15:8).

---

[90] O. Cullmann, "Der johanneische Gebrauch dopperdeutiger Ausdrücke als Schlüssel zum Verständnis des vierten Evangeliums," T. Z. Bas., 4 (1948), 360-372, insbes. 365-366. Cf. B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John, The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes*, Vol. I (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1954), p. 117.

In other words, the hour which has now struck is both the hour of his death and of his glory. Thus, John views the victory of Christ on the cross as one composite whole experience of humiliation and exaltation which is the decisive event in the history of salvation.

For John the passion of Christ is itself the crowning act of the fulfilment of God's purpose in history. This teaching is expressed in the use of the cognate verbs "to complete" (τελειοῦν) (John 4:34; 5:36; 17:4 and 23; 19:28) and "to finish" (τελεῖν) (John 19:28 and 30). Reflecting upon his entire earthly ministry and standing in the shadow of the cross, Jesus says,

> I glorified Thee on earth, having completed (τελειώσας) the work which Thou gavest me to do (John 17:4).

Here the Son glorifies the Father by his complete obedience and faithful fulfilment of his task. The aorist participle τελειώσας looks back upon the completed life of Jesus and probably also upon his death. The reference to his death is unmistakable in the Johannine use of the verb τελεῖν in the course of the passion narrative.

> When Jesus had received the vinegar, he said, "It is finished" (τετέλεσται); and he bowed his head and gave up his spirit (John 19:30; cf. John 19:28).

The perfect tense does not convey the idea of an instantaneous cry of relief that all is over but of a shout of victory that the results of his death will have lasting significance for all mankind. The term τετέλεσται actually has a double meaning which is both chronological and theological, i.e. "the life of the Incarnate One is ended" and "his work is completed."[91]

---

[91] O. Cullmann, *op. cit.*, S. 370. This double meaning applies not only to the verb τελεῖν but also to its cognate τελειοῦν. Arndt-Gingrich, *A Greek English Lexicon,* p. 818, points out two distinct usages of the verb τελειοῦν in the Fourth Gospel: a) It means (continued next page)

In the latter sense the reference is to the completion of the purpose of God for the redemption of the world. For John the death of Christ upon the cross means that the work of redemption has been completed. Because he interprets the cross as the place of Christ's humiliation and glorification, it is also viewed as the place where the purpose of God is fulfilled. Although Christ still has to rise from the dead to attain the fulness of his glorification, the victory has already been won, and the divine purpose has already been fulfilled.

The conclusion that John understands the redemptive work of Christ as taking place on the plane of history is unavoidable. In describing the mission of Christ it is not said that he is simply the Saviour but that he is "the Saviour of the world" (John 4:42). It is not said that he is just sent by the Father but that he is sent by the Father "into the world" (John 3:17; 17:18). It is not said that he is merely light but that he is "the light of the world" (John 8:12; 9:5; 11:9). The ministry of Christ begins with the Incarnation (John 1:14); it continues in a variety of miraculous events which are labeled "signs" (John 2:1-11, etc.) and in a succession of extended discourses which are accentuated by certain significant "sayings" (John 6:35, etc.); and it comes to a victorious climax in the crucifixion and the resurrection (John 12:23; 13:31). The thread which ties the entire Gospel together is the actualization of the purpose of God in the life of His Son. Therefore, the emphasis

---

(footnote 91 continued) "complete, finish, accomplish" (John 4:34; 5:36; 17:4; 19:28), and b) it means "bring to an end, bring to its goal" in the sense of "make perfect" (John 17:23). In the first usage it is impossible to distinguish between the chronological and the theological use of the term. O. Cullmann, op. cit., S. 364-365, also refers to the double meaning of the adverb ἄνωθεν in connection with the verb γεννηθῆναι (John 3:3 and 7; cf. John 3:31; 19:11 and 23). The expression γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν means either "to be born from above" (= of God) (cf. John 1:13; 1 John 3:9; 4:7; 5:1, 4, and 18) or "to be born again" (= a second time) (cf. 1 Pet. 1:3 and 23).

in the Fourth Gospel is upon an "earthly Saviour" in which the term "earthly" refers to the work of Christ on the plane of history and the term "Saviour" refers to his fulfilment of the redemptive purpose of God. The contrast will immediately become apparent upon turning to the understanding of the redemptive work of Christ in the Gospel of Truth.

(2) Heavenly Messenger. The central teaching of the Gospel of Truth is the way in which God uses the revelatory appearance of Christ to make known to man the divine origin of his existence. It is based on the understanding of Christ as a heavenly messenger who emanates from the Father. This conception finds expression in the view of the mission of Christ as the Saviour who emanates from the Father as a light shining upon the darkness of man's ignorance. The ministry of Christ is lost sight of except for his illumination of man as a "teacher" by the communication of his "teaching." The passion of Christ is interpreted as the defeat of Error, the recovery of man's true existence, and the reabsorption of man into the divine. In this way the Gospel of Truth divorces the redemptive work of Christ from the historical context of his earthly life and shifts the emphasis to the heavenly origin of man's true existence.

(a) The Mission of Christ. Like the Gospel of John the mission of Christ in the Gospel of Truth is based on his role as the Saviour. The Gnostic writer gives prominence to this aspect of his thought by mentioning it near the beginning of the homily.

> The Logos...is the one who is called the Saviour (σωτηρ), for that is the name of the work which he is to accomplish for the salvation (ⲤⲰⲦⲈ) of those who were ignorant of the Father (p. 16,34 - p. 17,1).

Here Christ is the "Saviour" (p. 16,37) in that his appearance is the revelation to man of his being rooted in God. Because of this work of "salvation" (p. 16,39) which he accomplishes, it is not necessary for man to remain ignorant concerning his true origin in the Father. In addition to the Greek nouns ⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ and ⲥⲱⲧⲉ, there are four occurrences of the Coptic noun ⲟⲩϫⲉⲉⲓ which means "salvation" (p. 20,8; p. 31,18; p. 32,25; p. 35,1). In the first passage the mission of Christ is figuratively described as the taking of "the Book" in full awareness that "his death meant life for many" (p. 20,12-14; cf. Mark 10:45).

> No one who believed in salvation (ⲡⲓⲟⲩϫⲉⲉⲓ)
> could appear until that Book became accessible (p. 20,6-9).

In other words, salvation is made accessible to man only by the revelatory appearance of Christ which comes to its climax in the crucifixion. For this reason the appearance of Christ is indispensible to man's salvation since it is the only way in which men come to know that they are rooted in the Father. Assuming that the only way of salvation is through Christ, the other three passages fill in the details by describing the process of salvation: it originates from the Father, it continues in His work of implanting the divine root in man, and it is completed in man's return to his heavenly origin. The origin of the process of salvation in the Father enables Him to communicate it to man through Christ.

> p. 31,16 He (= Christ)
> gave them thought and wisdom
> and mercy and salvation (ⲟⲩϫⲉⲉⲓⲁⲉ) and the
> Spirit of power
> which are (derived) from the limitlessness
> 20 and kindness (lit. sweetness) of the Father.

The fact that Christ "gave" (ⲁϥϯ) salvation to man is only possible because it had been given to him previously by the Father. This communication of the divine essence of the Father to the Son is expressed in the Gospel of Truth as the giving of the Father's "name" to the Son (p. 38,11-12; cf. John 17:11-12). Even though the process of salvation originates with the Father, its continuation takes place in the unceasing work of the Father in implanting His divine root in man.

p. 32,23 ... the Sabbath (σάββατον) is
that (day) on which it is not fitting for the
25 (work of) salvation (ⲠⲞⲨϪⲈⲈⲒ) to be idle,
so that you may speak of
the heavenly day (lit. the day which is above)
which has no night
and of the sun (lit. light)
30 which does not set because it is perfect.
Say then to your heart (= with firm conviction) that
you are this perfect day
and that in you dwells
34 the light which does not fail.

In the Gospel of John the term τὸ σάββατον is used fourteen times for "the (earthly) sabbath," i.e. the Jewish day of rest (John 5:9, 10, 16, and 18; 6:59; 7:22 and 23; 9:14 and 16; 19:31; 20:1 and 19), whereas the idea of "the (heavenly) Sabbath" is referred to only as "the last day" (τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ) (John 6:39, 40, 44, and 54). The term ⲠⲤⲀⲂⲂⲀⲦⲞⲚ is used twice in the Gospel of Truth for "the (heavenly) Sabbath" (p. 32,18 and 23-24), and the same idea reoccurs as "the heavenly day" (ⲠⲒϨⲰⲞⲨ ⲈⲦⲚ̄ϨⲢⲎⲈⲒ) (p. 32,27) and "the perfect day" (ⲠⲒϨⲰⲞⲨ ⲈⲦϪⲎⲔ) (p. 32,32). Taking his starting point from the Johannine teaching concerning the work of the Father on "the (earthly) sabbath" (John 5:16 and 18), the author of the Gospel of Truth shifts the emphasis from the continuous activity of God in Christ here on this earth to the self-awareness of man in the Father which is understood as the true "sabbath rest" (cf. Heb. 4:9). Because the divine root of the Father flows into man in an unimpeded way, the appearance of Christ is all that is necessary to bring man to an awareness of the divine origin of his existence in God. From this point on the true Gnostic knows that he is living in "the heavenly day" (p. 32,27), i.e. in the true "sabbath rest" in which he is one with the Father. In other words, he is already experiencing "this perfect day" (p. 32,32) since the light of God which does not fail is dwelling in him. Thus, the Father's work of salvation is a continuous process by which the life which comes from the divine root flows in an unimpeded way into the individual. This implanting of the divine root of the Father in man is described as "the coming of fulness (πλήρωμα) for those who are awaiting the salvation (ⲠⲒⲞⲨϪⲈⲈⲒⲦⲈⲈⲒ) which comes from above"(ⲘⲠⲤⲀⲚϨⲢⲈ) (p. 34,36 - p. 35,2). Here πλήρωμα is not used in the true Gnostic sense of "the totality of the thirty Aeons" or in the quasi-Gnostic sense of "the higher world of the Father" but in the Biblical sense of "that which has been completed" (cf. John 1:16; Rom. 11:25). The coming of fulness is complete only when "the salvation which comes from above" (p. 35,1-2) is made available to man by the appearance of Christ. The appearance of the Saviour is necessary in order to awaken in man the knowledge that man also has "something from above" (ⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲩ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ⲡⲥⲁϩⲣⲉ) (p. 42,12-13), i.e. his divine origin in the Father. The result is that "if anyone has knowledge, he is a being from above" (ϩⲙ̄ ⲠⲤⲀⲚϨⲢⲈ) (p. 22,4). The double meaning of the adverb ἄνωθεν in the Gospel of John immediately comes to mind (John 3:3 and 7; cf. John 3:31; 19:11 and 23). Whereas the expression γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν in the Fourth Gospel means both "to be born again" (= a second time, not in the sense of physical rebirth but of spiritual rebirth) and "to be born from above" (= of God), the Gnostic writer is not impressed by the ethical demands of man's "spiritual rebirth" in the new realm of the kingdom of God (John 3:19-21; 1 John 2:29; 4:7) but is interested only in the divine origin of man's salvation "from above" (John 3:3 and 7;

19:11; 1 John 3:9). Therefore, the process of salvation is completed in the Gospel of Truth when the appearance of Christ awakens the knowledge of man's divine origin "from above."

When the Gnostic interpretation of the mission of Christ as "the Saviour" who brings salvation to man is compared with the Fourth Gospel, there is an amazing similarity in the use of soteriological terminology. Both documents use the term σωτήρ once. For the Greek noun σωτηρία there is the Coptic noun ⲥⲱⲧⲉ. For the four occurrences of the Greek verb σώζειν there are four occurrences of the Coptic noun ⲟⲩϫⲉⲉⲓ. These similarities of terminology, however, are completely overshadowed by the differences in thought. In the Gospel of Truth salvation is necessary not because of man's sin but because of his ignorance. In the Gnostic treatise salvation is accomplished not by the identification of Christ with sinful men in this world but by the illumination of Christ with respect to man's true existence in the Father. Therefore, the common use of the term "Saviour" does not obscure the fact that the only redemptive work which Christ performs in the Gospel of Truth is the revelation to man of his being rooted in the Father.

The mission of Christ is further characterized in the Gnostic homily by the fact that he is one who emanates from the Father. Although the specific term "emanate" is not applied to the relationship between the Father and the Son, the same basic thought is expressed in the opening words of the Gospel of Truth which declare that "the *Logos*...*has come from* (ϣⲉϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϩⲓ̈ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ) the *Pleroma*" (p. 16,34-35). Here πλήρωμα is used in a quasi-technical sense for the "higher world" (ὑπερκόσμια) of the Father which is inhabited by various "Aeons" (ⲛⲓⲁⲓⲱⲛ) or "emanations" (ⲛⲓϯⲏ).[92] The priority of the *Logos* among all the

Aeons and emanations is indicated by the fact that "he was the first to come forth" (p. 37,9; cf. p. 37,16) from the Father. The *Logos* does not go forth on his own but is properly equipped with the name of the Father who "in the beginning named the one who came forth from Him" (p. 38,8-9; cf. p. 40,26-27). Starting from the existence of the *Logos* in the Father, the Gnostic writer then presents the emanation of the *Logos* from the Father. According to the Johannine pattern, the next step should be the identification of the *Logos* with the human predicament of man. This appears to be the case when it is said that "he (= Christ) came in the likeness of *flesh*" (σάρξ) (p. 31,5-6). The fact that

---

[92] The eleven occurrences of the term πλήρωμα in the Gospel of Truth fluctuate between the Biblical meaning of "fulness" in the sense of "that which has been completed" (p. 34,20 and 36; p. 35,8 and 29; cf. John 1:16; Rom. 11:25) and the quasi-Gnostic meaning of *Pleroma* in the sense of "the higher world of the Father" (p. 16,35; p. 35,35-36; p. 36,10; p. 41,1 and 14; p. 43,15-16; cf. p. 41,15-16). The term does not occur in the Gospel of Truth in the true Gnostic meaning of *Pleroma* in the sense of "the totality of the thirty Aeons." This latter usage is defined by C. A. Baynes, *A Coptic Gnostic Treatise*, pp. 17-18: "Collectively, it represents the fulness of the Divine perfections. ... Secondly, it stands for the Ideal World, the perfect archetype and pattern, hidden in Heaven, of which all subsequent phenomenal manifestation is an imperfect copy." The term αἰών occurs six times only in the plural (p. 19,1; p. 23,1 and 16; p. 24,17; p. 27,7; p. 38,35-36). It is defined by W. W. Harvey, *Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis Libros quinque Adversus Haereses* (Cambridge: University Press, 1857), Vol. I, p. cxix, as "an emanation from the divine substance, subsisting co-ordinately and co-eternally with the Deity, the Pleroma still remaining one." The term ϯΗ occurs six times only in the plural (p. 22,37; p. 26,25 and 29; p. 27,11; p. 41,14 and 16). G. Steindorff, *Die Apokalypse des Elias: Eine unbekannte Apokalypse und Bruchstücke der Sophonias-Apokalypse* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1899), S. 50, traces the origin of the term to "the rays of the sun." In the Gospel of Truth ϯΗ means essentially the same thing as "Aeons," except in the two instances in which ΝΙΑΙΩΝ is used in the sense of "the world" (p. 23,1 and 16; cf. Heb. 1:2; 11:3). Closely related to the one occurrence of the plural form "pleromas" (ϨΝΠΛΗΡΩΜΑ) (p. 41, 15-16) and the six occurrences each of the plural forms "Aeons" and "emanations" is the additional plural form "spaces" (ϨΝΜΑΕΙΤ) (p. 20,25; p. 25,10; p. 26,15; p. 27,10-11; p. 28,11; p. 42,8-9). The latter term also occurs in the singular as "space" (p. 27,25) and "place" (p. 22,26) and in the plural as "places" (p. 22,22).

his flesh is "incorruptible and incoercible" (p. 31,7-8), however, means that it is not affected by the limitations of this world. The one occurrence of the term "world" (κόσμος) (p. 24,23) in the Gospel of Truth is synonymous with the lower form of the existence of Christ which is characterized by "deficiency" (ϣⲧⲁ) (p. 24,21). This is counterbalanced by the higher form of his existence which is characterized by "completeness" (ⲟⲩϫⲱⲕ) (p. 24,28; cf. p. 25,3). Thus, there is no real involvement on the part of the Gnostic Christ with the sinful life of man here on this earth. Instead, the contrast between God and the world is overlooked. In the Gospel of Truth the world is divine because God created it, and the world also has its origin in God. The Gnostic writer never loses sight of the fact that Christ exists in the Father in such a way that he is absorbed into a strictly unitarian view of God. For this reason he becomes the principle of cosmic order which emanates from the Father, not the historic person who comes into the world in the form of human flesh.

Although the Johannine teaching that the Father sends the Son into the world is not found in the Gospel of Truth, there is one occurrence of the verb "to send" (ϫⲁⲩ) (p. 41,24) which refers to the emanations of the Father.

p. 41,15 All the emanations from the Father
are "pleromas" (πληρώματα) and in
all His emanations their root is in
Him who caused them all to grow forth from
Himself. He has given them
20 their destinies (lit. limits). Each one
is therefore revealed,
in order that out of their
own thought - . For (γάρ) the place
to which they send (ⲉⲧⲟⲩϫⲁⲩ) their thought,
25 that place is
their root which lifts them
through all heights
28 to the Father.

The thought and terminology of this passage are unquestionably Gnostic. Because the "emanations" from the Father contain His root, they are miniature representations of "His Pleroma" (ⲠⲈϤⲠⲖⲎⲢⲰⲘⲀ) (p. 41,14). Therefore, they are in reality "pleromas" (ϨⲚ̄ⲠⲖⲎⲢⲰⲘⲀ) (p. 41,16; cf. p. 36,10), i.e. little worlds in themselves which reflect the great world of the Father. This means that the individual "pleromas" of the emanations are microcosms of the one great "Pleroma" of the Father which is the macrocosm. The "root" of the emanations is in the Father because "he has given them their destinies" (ⲚⲞⲨⲦⲰϢ) (p. 41,19-20), i.e. because he has prescribed the limits of their operation in the Pleroma. Here the Coptic noun ⲠⲦⲰϢ (= ὁ ὅρος) is used in the Biblical sense of "determining the boundaries of their habitation" (ὁρίσας τὰς ὁροθεσίας τῆς κατοικίας αὐτῶν) (Acts 17:26; cf. Eph. 1:11).[93] The fact that the divine root flows into the emanations in an unimpeded way is not a one-way process. The establishment of two-way communication takes place when the emanations "send" (ⲞⲨϪⲀⲨ) (p. 41,24) their thought to "their root" (ⲦⲞⲨⲚⲞⲨⲚⲈ) (p. 41,26; cf. p. 17,30; p. 28,16-17; p. 41,17; p. 42,34-35) in the Father. In this way the emanations acknowledge that they are not independent beings but that the origin of their existence is in the Father. Since the Father desires that man acknowledge the divine origin of his existence in the same way, he allows the Logos to emanate from Him in order to communicate to man the message of his true existence in the Father. When man becomes aware of his divine origin, he also "sends" his thought to his root in the Father as an acknowledgment of the fact that the origin of his existence is not in himself but in God. Now the contrast between the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth is clear. For John the important thing is that the Father sends the Son into the world; for the Gnostic writer it is that man sends his thought to the Father. Therefore, this aspect of the mission of Christ is understood quite differently in the two documents. In the Gospel of John the mission of Christ is an expression of the redemptive purpose of God in history. In the Gospel of Truth it is an awakening of the divine essence of God in man.

---

[93] In the fully developed Valentinian system ὅρος becomes the technical term "Limit" which forms the boundary between the higher world of the Pleroma and the lower world of matter (Irenaeus, Adv. Haer., I, 5,1). In this sense Horos is also called Stauros (Σταυρός) since the horizontal bar of the T-shaped "cross" becomes the Limit which separates the upper and the lower world, whereas the vertical bar separates the right and left areas of the lower world. This is a good example of the way in which the bizarre imagination of the later Gnostics begins to work on the idea of redemption by the cross. Cf. C. A. Baynes, op. cit., pp. 46-47, and H. Jonas, Gnostic Religion, p. 186, note 16.

The mission of Christ is also described in the Gospel of Truth as the bringing of light to the darkness of man's ignorance. This teaching is found in the fourteen occurrences of the noun "light" (ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲛ) (p. 25,1 and 18; p. 28,29; p. 30,6, 36, and 37; p. 31,14; p. 32,29 and 34; p. 34,7; p. 35,5 and 28; p. 36,11; p. 43,12) and in the three occurrences of the verb "to enlighten" (ⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲛ) (p. 18,17 and 18-19; p. 28,28-29). The Gospel of Truth presupposes that the predicament of man is caused by ignorance which expresses itself in a life of "darkness," "forgetfulness," and "terror," and it affirms that this predicament is overcome by the revelatory appearance of Christ as "the light" (p. 31,14; p. 34,7; p. 35,28).

p. 18,15 This hidden mystery (μυστήριον) (= the gospel)
has enlightened (ⲁϥⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲛ) those who were
in darkness
by means of Jesus Christ.
He (= Jesus) has enlightened (ⲁϥⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲛ) them
out of forgetfulness
19 (and) has given (them) a way (into knowledge).

p. 28,28 When
the light illuminated (ⲡⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲣⲉϥⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲛ) the terror
30 which that (man) had received, he (= that one)
knows that it (= the terror) is nothing.
In this way they were
ignorant of the Father because
p. 29,1 they did not see Him.

The ignorance of man is a condition of which he is not aware until the revelatory appearance of Christ enlightens him concerning his true existence in the Father. The illumination which Christ brings eliminates man's darkness, overcomes his forgetfulness, and reveals that the true basis of his terror is nothing at all. The idea of conflict between light and darkness is further developed in two more passages.

p. 24,32 As
one's ignorance
disappears then (τότε) of itself
35 when he (= the true Gnostic) gains knowledge
- namely his ignorance - (and)
as darkness disappears
when light (ⲡⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲛ) appears,
p. 25,1 so the deficiency is also
eliminated by
3 completeness.

p. 25,12 By means of
knowledge he (= the true Gnostic) will purify himself
out of a diversity of nature into
15 a unity, while he consumes
matter (ὕλη) within him
like a flame and darkness
18 by light (ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲛ), (and overcomes) death by life.

Man's existence apart from the illumination of Christ is one of "darkness" (ⲕⲉⲕⲉⲓ) (p. 18,17; p. 24,37; p. 25,17-18) in that he lives only for himself. It is equivalent to living in the "night" (ⲟⲩϣⲏ) (p. 28,28; p. 30,4; p. 32,28; cf. John 3:2; 9:4; 11:10; 13:30; 19:39; 21:3), i.e. living a shadowy form of existence that is not real. The appearance of Christ is likened to the coming of daylight (p. 28,24-32; p. 30,2-6) in that man becomes aware of his true existence in the Father.

The illumination which Christ brings makes it possible for the true self of man to become an integrated whole instead of being fragmented in an illusory existence of darkness. This wholeness of the self is described as "completeness" (ⲡⲓϫⲱⲕ) (p. 25,3; cf. p. 24,28) and "unity" (ⲙⲛⲧⲟⲩⲉⲉⲓ) (p. 25,15) in contrast to the fragmented life of "deficiency" (ϣⲧⲁ) (p. 25,2) and "diversity of nature" (ⲧⲟ ⲛ̄ⲣⲏⲧⲉ) (p. 25,14). In this way Christ enables man to dicover "the light of truth" (ⲡⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲏⲉ) (p. 36,11) and to enter "the perfect light" (ⲡⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓⲛ ⲉⲧϫⲏⲕ (p. 43,12-13) which is equivalent to recognizing that the divine "seed" (σπέρμα) (p. 43,14; cf. 1 John 3:9) of the Father dwells in him. In contrast to his former existence the Gnostic is now likened to "the light in which there is no shadow" (p. 35,5-6) because "the light which does not fail dwells in him" (p. 32,33-34). Therefore, the purpose of the appearance of Christ is to shed light on the true origin of man's existence in the Father.

It is apparent that the idea of conflict between light and darkness is prominent in both the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth. The fact that both documents use the terms "light" and "darkness" is in itself misleading since the basic pattern of thought is quite different. In the Gospel of John "darkness" is an ethical term for man's state of unbelief in this world which is antagonistic to the purpose of God, and "light" is identified with the person of Christ whose coming into the world overcomes the darkness. In the Gospel of Truth "darkness" is a metaphysical term for man's state of ignorance which is based on an utterly mistaken view of his existence only in himself, and "light" is the new dimension of the origin of his existence in the Father which is communicated by Christ. For John the crux of the matter is the presence of the person of Christ in the world; for the Gnostic writer it is the illumination of the origin of man's existence in the Father. This contrast is expressed in Christ's self-designation as "the light of the world" (John 8:12a; 9:5; 11:9) and in man's discovery of "the light of truth" (p. 36,11). Therefore, the mission of Christ in the Gospel of Truth is not an expression of the redemptive purpose of God in history but an awakening of the divine essence of God in man.

(b) The Ministry of Christ. In the Gospel of Truth the ministry of Christ has meaning only in connection with the crucifixion. It is because of his death on the cross that the work of Christ can be described as the illumination of a "teacher" (ⲥⲁϩ) (p. 19,20) and the communication of his "teaching" (ⲥⲉⲃⲱ) (p. 21,2; cf. p. 20,28; p. 23,20).

The unfolding of the ministry of Christ in the role of a teacher is closely connected with the idea of "judgment" in the Gospel of Truth. Without alluding to any specific scene of the Gospel story, the Gnostic homily contains a vague reminiscence of the encounter of Jesus with the scribes and Pharisees in their synagogues.

p. 19,19 He (= Christ) appeared in the midst of their
school (and) spoke
the word as a teacher (ⲥⲁϩ).
Those who were wise (σοφός)
in their own estimation came to him,
in order to put him to the test (πειράζειν).
But (δέ) he put them to shame because
they were empty. They hated
him because they were not actually
wise men. After all these,
the little children also came to him,
to whom belongs
the knowledge of the Father.

The Gnostic writer recollects the fact that Jesus had confronted various scribes and Pharisees (= wise men) in their synagogues (e.g. Matt. 4:23;

Mk. 1:21; Lk. 4:15; John 6:59. 18:20) and that they had tested him on many occasions (e.g. Matt. 16:1; Mk. 8:11; Lk. 11:16; John 8:6 ; cf. John 6:6). This confrontation of Christ with the scribes and Pharisees is expressed in the Gospel of Truth in terms of the appearance of Christ as a teacher in the midst of their "school" (ⲘⲀ Ⲛ̄ϪⲒ ⲤⲂⲰ) (p. 19,19) which literally means "place for receiving instruction" (= synagogue). The important thing, however, is not the encounter of Christ with various scribes and Pharisees in their synagogues but the relationship of Christ to man as a "teacher" (ⲤⲀϨ) (p. 19,20). That which he communicates as a teacher exposes those who are "wise (σόφος) in their own estimation" (p. 19,22) and enables those who are "little children" (ⲔⲈⲔⲞⲨⲒ ϢⲎⲘ) (p. 19,28-29) to come to him (cf. Matt. 11:25; Lk. 10:21; 18:17; John 13:33; 1 John 3:7). This is a dramatic way of saying that the appearance of Christ will separate the "wise men" from the "little children," i.e. the non-Gnostics from the true Gnostics. In other words, his appearance brings judgment upon the non-Gnostics who are "empty" (p. 19,25) and makes the true Gnostics aware of their possession of "the knowledge of the Father" (p. 19,30).

The idea of judgment in the Gospel of Truth is explained more directly in the curious allegory of "the jars" (ⲚⲒⲤⲔⲈⲨⲞⲤ) (p. 25,28 and 33; p. 26,10; p. 36,21; cf. John 19:29).

p. 25,25 (It is) like people
who moved from places
where they had
jars (σκεῦος) which were not good (any more) in one
place (τοπος).
30 They usually break them, and (in spite of that)
the master of the house does not suffer loss,
but (αλλα) he rejoices, for (γαρ) in
place of these jars (σκεῦος) which
were defective (are) those which are full (and)
35 complete, for this is,
the judgment (κρισις) which has come

p. 26,1 from above (and) which has judged
everyone as a drawn,
two-edged sword cutting on
this side and that.
5 When the Word (= Logos) which is in
the heart of those who pronounce it
had appeared, - it was not only a sound
but (ἀλλά) also took on a body (σῶμα) - a great
disturbance occurred among
10 the jars (σκεῦος), for some had been
emptied (but) others had been filled.
For behold, some had been provided (with contents)
(but) others had been overturned;
some had been purified (but) still others
15 had been broken.

Here "judgment" (κρίσις) (p. 25,36) is described figuratively as the breaking of empty jars which were defective and the purifying of full jars that are complete. The jars which "were emptied" (ⲁϩⲟⲩ ϣⲟⲩⲱⲟⲩ) (p. 26,11) are in reality wise men who were "empty" (ϣⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧ) (p. 19,25) and the ones which "were filled" (p. 26,11) are actually little children who possess "the knowledge of the Father" (p. 19,30). This means that the "judgment" which results from the appearance of Christ separates the non-Gnostics from the true Gnostics. On the one hand, the "wise men" (= the non-Gnostics) are identified as those who were "defective" (ϩⲁⲩ) (p. 25,34) and, therefore, they have no hope of salvation. On the other hand, the "little children" (= the true Gnostics) are recognized as "those who are complete" (ⲚⲈⲦⲈ ϢⲀⲨϪⲀⲔⲞⲨ) (p. 25,35; cf. p. 25,9) and, therefore, no part of their existence lacks the indwelling of the Father. Although the terminology is different, the first part of the allegory of the jars clearly reflects the Johannine understanding of the coming of Christ as "judgment."

> He who believes in him is not condemned; he who does not believe is condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the only Son of God. And this is the judgment (κρίσις), that the light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil (John 3:18-19; cf. Heb. 4:12).

In the Fourth Gospel the appearance of Christ separates "the one who does not believe" from "the one who believes," i.e. the non-Christian from the true Christian. In this respect his appearance brought judgment upon the non-Christians because "their deeds were evil" (ἦν αὐτῶν πονηρὰ τὰ ἔργα) (John 3:19b). For John the predicament of man is an inward perversion of sin which expresses itself outwardly in "unbelief" and "evil deeds." The author of the Gospel of Truth understands the predicament of man as an inward disposition of Error which expresses itself in "ignorance" and "emptiness." Although the author of the Gnostic document is indebted to the Fourth Gospel for the idea of judgment, he obviously reinterprets it to suit his own particular purpose. By emphasizing the role of Jesus as a teacher, the illumination which he brings either exposes man's emptiness or makes him aware of the root of his existence in the Father.

The second part of the allegory of the jars describes the meaning of the appearance of Christ as a teacher just for the benefit of the true Gnostics. This time "the full jars" (ⲚⲤⲔⲈⲨⲞⲤ ⲈⲦⲘⲎϨ) (p. 36,21) signify "those who are perfect" (p. 36,20).

p. 36,13 For this reason
they spoke of Christ (χριστός) among themselves
(lit. in their midst)
15 in order that (ἵνα) those who had been disturbed
might receive a (way of) returning (to the Father)
and (that) he (= Christ) might anoint them with
the anointing. This anointing is
the mercy of the Father who will have mercy
upon them, and (δέ) those whom he anointed
20 are those who are perfect (ⲚⲚⲈⲒ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀϨϪⲰⲔ).
For (γάρ) it is the full jars (σκεῦος) that
men are accustomed to anoint. But (δέ) as soon as
the anointing of one (jar) is removed,
it flows out. And the cause
25 of its deficiency is
that its anointing is withdrawn.

For (γάρ) (at) that time
a single breath is accustomed to fill it (= the
    defective vessel)
through the power which is with Him (= of the Father).
On the contrary (ἀλλά), concerning this one who is
faultless, nothing will be sealed up
with him nor (οὐδέ) will anything flow out;
instead (ἀλλά), the perfect Father (ⲠⲒⲰⲦ ⲈϤϪⲎⲔ)
    fills up (= overcomes) again
that which is deficient in him.

Instead of describing the non-Gnostics as those who were "defective" (p. 25,34), this part of the allegory of the jars refers to the true Gnostics prior to the appearance of Christ as "those who had been disturbed" (ⲚⲚⲈⲒ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀϨ ϢⲦⲀⲢⲦⲢ̄) (p. 36, 16; cf. p. 26,6 and 16; p. 29,2-3, 11, and 30; p. 36,16; John [5:4]; 5:7; 11:13; 12:27; 13:21; 14:1 and 27). The appearance of Christ is described as an "anointing" (ⲦⲰϨⲤ̄) (p. 36,17, 23, and 26; cf. 1 John 2:20 and 27).[94] The true Gnostics thus come to realize that they are "those who are perfect" (p. 36,20; cf. p. 18,14; p. 21,18; p. 23,11; p. 32,32; p. 34,34; p. 43,19), i.e. those who experience the limit of their potentialities in the Father. This realization is possible because "the perfect Father" (p. 36,33; cf. p. 18,33; p. 27,24; p. 36,35; p. 39,2; p. 42,16 and 28) enables man to overcome "that which is deficient in him" (ⲠⲈⲦϤ̄ϢⲀⲀⲦ Ⲙ̄ⲘⲀϤ ϢⲀϤ) (p. 36,33; cf. p. 24,21, 26, 29, and 32; p. 25,2). It is in contrast to the former deficient existence of the true Gnostic before the appearance of Christ that the two usages of the term ϪⲰⲔ can be discerned. In the first part of the allegory of the jars the true Gnostics are described as "those who are complete" (ⲚⲈⲦⲈϢⲀⲨ ϪⲀⲔⲞⲨ) (p. 25,34-35); in the second part of the allegory they are described as "those who are perfect" (ⲚⲚⲈⲒ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀϨϪⲰⲔ) (p. 36,20). In the former instance the true existence of the Gnostic in the Father is thought of from the negative standpoint of "having no part lacking;" in the latter instance this true existence is thought of from the positive standpoint of "attaining the limit of one's potentialities." The same contrast is apparent in the thirty occurrences of the term ϪⲰⲔ. It occurs twenty-one times as a verb, of which two mean "to complete" (p. 25,9 and 35) and nineteen mean "to be perfect" (p. 18,14 and 33; p. 21,18; p. 23,11 and 23; p. 26,31; p. 27,15 and 24; p. 32,30 and 32; p. 34,34; p. 36,20 and 35; p. 39,2; p. 40,19; p. 42,16 and 28; p. 43,13 and 19). It occurs nine times as a noun, of which two mean "completion" (p. 24,28; p. 25,3) and seven mean "perfection" (p. 18,36; p. 19,4 and 7; p. 20,39; p. 21,9 and 18; p. 37,1). The inspiration for this twofold usage can be found in the Johannine use of the verb τελειοῦν as "complete" (John 4:4; 5:36; 17:4; 19:28) and "make perfect" (John 17:23). In the Gospel of John Christ acknowledges his fulfilment of the purpose of God in his entire ministry when he says, "I glorified Thee on earth, having completed the work which Thou gavest me to do" (τὸ ἔργον τελειώσας ὃ δέδωκάς μοι) (John 17:4). Moreover, the purpose of God is revealed by Christ "in order that they (= the Christians) may attain perfect unity" (lit. that they may be perfected into one) (ἵνα ὦσιν τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἕν) (John 17:23; cf. 1 John 2:5; 4:12, 17, and 18), i.e. that God's purpose may be fulfilled in and through the Church. Whereas John understands both usages of τελειοῦν in the light of the double meaning of chronology and theology, this ambiguity is not grasped by the Gnostic writer who shifts the emphasis from the actualization of God's purpose in the earthly life of Christ to the self-awareness of man's divine origin in the Father.

---

[94] F. Schmidtke, "Zum Evangelium Veritatis 36,7ss: ['Gesalbte Gefässe']," *T. L. Z.*, 85 (1960), 713-714, connects the "anointing" of Christ in the Gospel of Truth with the general practice of "spreading over or smearing," not with the technical act of anointing: "Those who are perfect are compared, therefore, with filled vessels, perhaps wine jars, which must be spread over or smeared with tar or pitch and thus sealed. If the seal breaks, then the content of the vessel flows out" (S. 174).

Because the appearance of Christ enables the true Gnostics to experience an existence in the Father which is both "complete" and "perfect," the remainder of the "teaching" of Jesus (as in the second part of the allegory of the jars) is devoted exclusively to the true Gnostics. It is said that he gives "instruction to those who should receive instruction" (ⲥⲉⲃⲱ ⲛⲛⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲁϫ[ⲓ] ⲥⲃ[ⲱ]) (p. 21,2) i.e. to the true Gnostics. The nature of his teaching is described in the two uses of the verb "to teach" (ⲣ̄ⲧⲁⲙⲟ) (p. 18,21; p. 30,33) and the nine uses of the verb "to speak" (ⲣ̄ϣⲉϫⲉ) (p. 23,21; p. 31,10, 12 and 13; p. 37,11; p. 40,19, 27-28, and 31; p. 41,5) with reference to the ministry of Christ.

p. 30,32 When he had appeared
to teach (ⲉϥⲧⲁⲙⲟ) them concerning the
illimitable Father, when he had breathed into them
35 that which is in the thought (of the Father) while
doing His will, when many had received
the light, they turned
p. 31,1 to Him (= the Father).

Here the teaching of Christ concerning the nature of the illimitable Father enables the true Gnostics to receive the light and to turn to the Father. The same thought is veiled in more esoteric language when it is said that "the light spoke (ⲉⲁϥϣⲉϫⲉ) through his mouth" (p. 31,13-14). In other words, that which came out of the mouth of Christ was his teaching which became "the light" for man (cf. John 12:46). His teaching is not only described as "the light" but it is also equated with "the truth": "And this way is the truth which he taught them" (ⲉⲛⲧⲁϥⲧⲁⲙⲁⲩ ⲁⲣⲁⲥ) (p. 18,20-21). Here the teaching of Christ becomes "the truth" for man (cf. John 14:6) which restores all the creatures of forgetfulness to their true existence in the Father. Just as Jesus "appeared to teach them concerning the illimitable Father...while doing His will" (p. 30,32-36), it is also true that "his teaching expressed (ⲉⲥϣⲉϫⲉ) Him" (= the Father) (p. 23,20-21), i.e. his teaching accurately expressed the Father's will for man (cf. John 4:34; 5:30; 6:38-40). The same thought is expanded upon when it is said that he alone "uttered" (ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ̄ϣⲉϫⲉ) (p. 40,19) the unutterable name of the Father. Moreover, "he declared (ⲉϥϣⲉϫⲉ) what was in the heart of the Father" (p. 31,10-11), and "he spoke (ⲁϥϣⲉϫⲉ) about His (= the Father's) hidden things" (p. 40,27-28). The teaching of Jesus which reflects the Father's will for man is summed up in the collective term "word" (= message) which expresses the whole of what he said in his ministry: "he proclaimed (ⲙ̄ⲡϣⲉϫⲉ) the faultless word" (p. 31,12), and "he speaks (ⲉϥϣⲉϫⲉ) the unique word (λόγος) in silent grace (χάρις) (p. 37,11-12; cf. p. 34,2). As in the Gospel of John, the epitome of the gospel message is "the word which Jesus spoke" (John 2:22; 4:50).

The climax of the teaching of Jesus in the Gospel of Truth is reached in the communication of the message that the Father's "Resting-Place" is the "place" from which man has come forth and to which he will return.

p. 40,30 For this reason He (= the Father) indeed brought
this one (= the Son)
forth, in order that he might speak (ⲉϥⲁϣⲉϫⲉ)
about the place (ⲡⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ) and (about) His (= the
Father's)
Resting-Place (ⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲙⲧⲁⲛ) from which he (= the
Son) had come forth

p. 41,1 and in order that he might glorify the Pleroma
(πλήρωμα),
the greatness of His (= the Father's) name, and
the kindness (lit. sweetness) of the Father.
He (= the Son) will speak (ϥⲛⲁϣⲉϫⲉ) about
5 the place (ⲡⲙⲁ) from which each individual (man)
has come forth,

> and he (= each man) will hasten in order to return again
> 7 to the place (ⲧⲧⲁⲉⲓⲉ) from which he had received his origin (lit. establishment).

The influence of the Fourth Gospel again provides the inspiration for the Gnostic idea of the Father's "Resting-Place" (ⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲙⲧⲁⲛ) (p. 40,32-33; cf. p. 36,39; p. 41,13; p. 43,1) and of man's return to it. In addition to the designation "Resting-Place," the same idea is expressed as "(heavenly) place" in four occurrences of the term τόπος (p. 40,32; p. 42,37, 38-39, and 40; cf. p. 33,19-20), in seven occurrences of the term ⲙⲁ (p. 34,15; p. 41,4, 9, 10, 11, 23, and 25), and in one occurrence of the term ⲧⲁⲉⲓⲉ (p. 41,5-6; cf. p. 32,14). It is striking that all four expressions occur in the passage quoted above. In this connection the words of Jesus immediately come to mind when he says,

> In my Father's house are many dwelling-places (μοναί); if it were not so, would I have told you that I go to prepare a place (τόπον) for you. And when I go and prepare a place (τόπον) for you, I will come again, that where I am you may be also (John 14:2-3).

The term μοναί literally means "resting-places" on a main road where travellers can find refreshment and then comes to mean a permanent "dwelling-place" with "rooms for many" (cf. John 14:23).[95] The two occurrences of τόπος for "a (heavenly) place" (John 14:2-3) are unique in the Fourth Gospel; the remaining fifteen uses of the term occur with reference to a geographical location (John 4:20; 5:13; 6:10 and 23; 10:40; 11:6, 30, and 48; 18:2; 19:13, 17, 20, and 41; 20:7 and 25). Exactly the opposite emphasis is found in the Gospel of Truth. Whereas there are seemingly only three occurrences of τόπος (p. 25,29 and ⲙⲁ (p. 25,26; p. 35,30) in the Gnostic document in connection with a geographical location, there are eleven uses of the two terms for "the (heavenly) place." The implication is that the Gnostic writer takes his point of departure from the promise of Jesus to bring the disciples to the heavenly dwelling-places which he is about to prepare for the disciples in the whole process of his passion and glorification. Nevertheless, the author of the Gospel of Truth does not understand the Johannine teaching as an expression of the fulfilment of God's purpose for man but reinterprets it according to his own understanding of the self-awareness of man's divine origin in the Father. Therefore, the ministry of Christ in the Gnostic treatise consists merely of his illumination of man as a teacher and his communication to man through his teaching, both of which awaken in man an awareness of the true origin of his existence in the Father.

---

[95] O. Schaefer, "Der Sinn der Rede Jesu von den vielen Wohnungen in seines Vaters Hause und von dem Weg zu ihm (Joh. 14:1-7)," Z. N. T. W., 32 (1933), 210-217, insbes. 212.

In spite of certain similarities of terminology, the understanding of the ministry of Christ in the Gospel of Truth is largely incompatible with Johannine thought. There are two basic ingredients in the Johannine understanding of the ministry of Christ which cannot be found in the Gospel of Truth, i.e. a teleological perspective and a gospel pattern.[96] For John the entire ministry of Christ is an expression of the purpose of God at work in history. In the Gospel of John Jesus is referred to eight times as a "teacher" (διδάσκαλος) (John 1:39; 3:2 and 10; [8:4]; 11:28; 13:13 and 14; 20:16). The title is used twice as a synonym for "Rabbi" (John 1:38; 20:16) and places Christ within the framework of God's Chosen People, Israel. Since Jesus is "the truth" (John 14:6), all the "I am" sayings in the Fourth Gospel indicate that God's work in the past was only of a provisional character actually pointed to its full realization in Jesus Christ. For example, he is "the bread of life" (John 16:35). This means that in contrast to the heavenly manna which the Israelites ate in the wilderness without prolonging their lives (Exodus 16:35), Jesus brings "eternal life" (John 6:40). Moreover, he is the true rock from which flows "living water" (John 7:37-38; cf. Exodus 17:6) and the pillar of light which dispells all darkness by giving "the light of life" (John 8:12; cf. Exodus 13:21). Therefore, all the past substitutes for the truth lose their significance now that "the truth" has been realized in the life of Jesus Christ. Therefore, the presentation of the ministry of Christ in the Fourth Gospel assumes that the purpose of God for His Chosen People reaches its climax in the coming of Christ. The Gospel of Truth completely overlooks this teleological perspective of God's work in history toward His projected goal in the coming of Christ. Instead, there is a disparagement of history which is based on the separation of appearance from reality in Greek philosophy. For this reason the author of the Gospel of Truth is much more concerned about the eternal reality of man's existence in God than the physical presence of Christ on earth.

---

[96] Otto A. Piper, "Unchanging Promises: Exodus in the New Testament," *Interpr.*, 11 (1957), 3-22, esp. 12, and "The Origin of the Gospel Pattern," *J. B. L.*, 78 (1959), 115-124.

In the Gospel of John the ministry of Christ is presented in the literary form of a definite "gospel pattern." This pattern reveals the aspects of the earthly work of Christ which the apostles considered essential for the understanding of his mission. It begins with the appearance of John the Baptist, continues in the presentation of the healing and teaching ministry of Jesus, and reaches its climax in the passion narrative. The fact that John is following this basic pattern is indicated by the skillful way in which the name and function of the Baptist are woven into the Prologue (John 1:6 and 15). It is also indicated by his arrangement of the healing and teaching ministry of Christ in terms of miraculous works and extended discourses. In this connection there are ten occurrences of the verb "to teach" (διδάσκειν) (John 6:59; 7:14, 28, and 35; [8:2] 8:20 and 28; 9:34; 14:26; 18:20) and three occurrences of the noun "teaching" (διδαχή) (John 7:16 and 17; 18:19). The use of the gospel pattern also accounts for the careful attention that is given to the details of the passion of Christ. This gospel pattern is essential for the understanding of God's purpose in history. Although room is left for diversity in the selection and arrangement of material, the adherence to the basic gospel pattern is not optional and carries with it a definite kerygmatic authority. The absence of a teaching and healing ministry of Christ in the Gospel of Truth makes it clear that the Gnostic writer does not consider the earthly life of Jesus to be an essential part of his presentation of the gospel. The only aspect of the life of Christ in the Gnostic homily which has significance for man is the crucifixion, and it is interpreted in a highly symbolical manner. Therefore, the discussion of the redemptive work of Christ will be concluded with an exposition of the meaning of the crucifixion in the Gospel of Truth.

(c) The Passion of Christ. In the Gospel of Truth the passion of Christ is not understood as an act of self-giving by which the Father reveals his redemptive purpose to man but as an act of illumination by which man is enabled to discover the true origin of his existence in the Father. This interpretation of the crucifixion includes the defeat of Error, the recovery of man's true existence, and the reabsorption of man into the divine.

The necessity for the defeat of Error in the Gospel of Truth has its roots in the pre-cosmic struggle between Truth and Error (p. 17,4 - p. 18,5) which is actually re-enacted in the struggle between Jesus and Error on the cross. The victory of Truth over Error in the realm of ultimate reality leaves little doubt as to the outcome of the conflict between Jesus and Error in the shadowy realm of phenomena. The author of the Gospel of Truth does not recount the preliminary stages of the latter struggle since he is interested only in the *dénouement*. The climax comes in the one decisive blow in which Error attempts to annihilate on the cross the personification of Truth in Jesus Christ.

p. 18,21 For this reason
Error (πλάνη) became angry with him (= Jesus),
(so) it
persecuted him. It was endangered by him,
(so) it annihilated him. He was nailed to a
(*cross of*) *wood* (ϣⲉ), (but)
he became a fruit of the knowledge of
26 the Father.

p. 20,23 For this reason Jesus appeared
(and) clothed (lit. veiled) himself with that Book.
He was nailed to a (*cross of*) *wood* (ϣⲉ), (but)
he made known (lit. affixed) the decree (διάταγμα) of
27 the Father on the *cross* (σταυρός).

These three uses of the idea of the "cross" point the way to the heart of the redemptive work of Christ in the Gospel of Truth. In both passages there is an interesting contrast between what Error intended and what actually happened. The contrast is accentuated by adding the adversative conjunction "but," i.e. Error annihilated him, *but* he became a fruit of the knowledge of the Father; he was nailed to a cross, *but* he made known the decree of the Father. In other words, instead of becoming a victim of Error, Christ became a victor over Error. The result was that "he (= Christ) abolished them (= the forces of Error) with *power* (ϭⲁⲙ) and defeated them (lit. put them to shame) with *knowledge*" (ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ) (p. 31,26-27). This means that the cross is a symbol for the communication of knowledge to man, so that man can also have the same power over Error.

In one passage in the homily Error is personified as the "Devil" (διάβολος) (p. 33,20), implying that the victory of Christ on the cross is actually the defeat of the Devil.

p. 33,19 Do not become a dwelling-place (- τόπος)
for the Devil (διάβολος), because you
21 have already destroyed him.

The use of the term τόπος for "a (human) dwelling-place" (p. 33,19) is echoed again in four uses of the term ⲘⲀ (p. 24,25 and 26; p. 29,11 and 17; cf. p. 34,5). In this command of prohibition the true Gnostics need not fear that the Devil will possess them because the victory of Christ on the cross means that the Devil has already been judged and overthrown. The non-Gnostics who share with Error its "hylic substance" (ὕλη) (p. 17,15), however, do not have this assurance and will receive the "judgment" (κρίσις) (p. 25,36) of Christ. Therefore, the passion of Christ has real significance for the Gnostic because it gives him the assurance of the same victory over the Devil that was won by Christ himself on the cross.

This aspect of the understanding of the crucifixion in the Gospel of Truth clearly reflects the influence of the Fourth Gospel. Although John is not interested in the pre-cosmic struggle between Truth and Error, he does interpret the passion in terms of the victory of Christ over the Devil. In this connection he describes the adversary of Christ as "the ruler of this world" (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:8 and 11) who is identified twice as the "Devil" (διάβολος) (John 8:44; 13:2) and once as "Satan" (σατανᾶς) (John 13:27). The Jews as representatives of the unbelief of the world toward Christ are characterized as belonging to their father "the Devil" (John 8:44). The term διάβολος is also applied to Judas in the sense of his being used as an instrument of the

Devil (John 6:70; cf. John 13:2 and 27). The fact that the Devil completely possessed Judas is justification in itself for the command of prohibition in the Gospel of Truth: "Do not become a dwelling-place of the Devil, because you have already destroyed him" (p. 33,19-21). The Gnostic, therefore, has the assurance that the power of the Devil has been broken by the death of Christ (p. 31,26-27; cf. John 12:31-32). This aspect of the thought of the Gospel of Truth clearly points to the influence of the Fourth Gospel, but the Gnostic writer goes beyond the Gospel of John when he explains the temporal conflict between Christ and the Devil in terms of the pre-temporal conflict between Truth and Error which had already been fought and resolved. The inspiration for this teaching is Plato's theory of ideas which distinguishes between the eternal, unchanging world of ultimate reality and the temporal, changing world of phenomena.

The passion of Christ also has meaning for the Gnostic in terms of the recovery of the true origin of his existence in the Father. Whereas the defeat of Error by Christ is the negative side of the crucifixion, the positive side is the recovery of Christ's higher form of existence. This interpretation of the death of Christ is also contained in the two passages in which the idea of the "cross" is used. It appears once as the Greek noun σταυρός (p. 20,27) which literally means "an upright stake" and twice as the Coptic noun ϣⲉ (p. 18,24; p. 20,25) which literally means "(a cross of) wood" in the sense of "an accursed tree" (cf. Deut. 20:22-23).[97] Although the common word for "cross" in the New

---

[97] The two words are used interchangeably in Coptic for "cross." For example, the Coptic version of Matt. 27:40 in the Bohairic dialect reads: "If thou art (the) Son of God, come down from *the tree* (lit. wood)" (ⲡⲓϣⲉ) - G. Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect Otherwise Called Memphitic and Bohairic*, Vol. I (Oxford: Clarenden Press, 1898), (continued next page)

Testament is σταυρός (e.g. John 19:17, 19, 25, and 31), there are also five occurrences of ξύλον as "an accursed tree" (Acts 5:30; 10:39; 13:29; Gal. 3:13; 1 Pet. 2:24). The use of ϢⲈ in the Gospel of Truth, however, is not limited to this usage of ξύλον but also reflects the influence of the phrase "the tree of life" (τὸ ξύλον τῆς ζωῆς) (Rev. 2:7; 22:2, 14, and 19; cf. Gen. 2:9). This influence becomes apparent in the five uses of the term "fruit" (ⲞⲨⲦⲀϨ - p. 18,25; p. 23,35; p. 28,17-18; p. 33,38; καρπός - p. 28,7) in the Gospel of Truth. It is said that the crucifixion enables Jesus to become a "*fruit* (ⲞⲨⲦⲀϨ) of the knowledge of the Father" (p. 18,25-26; cf. p. 23,35). In the New Testament "eating of the tree of life which is in the paradise of God" (Rev. 2:7) is a figurative expression for the attainment of eternal life in the security of heaven. In the Gospel of Truth the fact that Jesus becomes "a fruit of the knowledge of the Father" (p. 18,25-26) means that the crucifixion frees him from the limitations of the lower form of his existence and allows him to return to the true form of his existence in the Father. This interpretation is confirmed by the exclamatory comment which follows the second passage in which the idea of the "cross" is used.

p. 20,28 Oh, such great teaching when he humbles himself
(lit. brings himself down)
unto death, (already) being
30 clothed with eternal life. When he had divested
himself of these perishable rags (= the body
which had become of no use to him),

(footnote 97 continued) pp. 266-267. The use of ξύλον for the "cross" of Christ is a favorite expression of the Valentinian Gnostics. Heracleon's Commentary on John understands the "wood" (ξύλον) to which the whip is tied for Christ's cleansing of the Temple (John 2:15) as a symbol for the cross of Christ: "The gambling merchants and all wickedness were nailed upon this wood and destroyed" (Origen, *Com. on John*, X, 33). The expression is also used by Marcus the Magician who speaks of the sixth hour "in which he (= Christ) was nailed to the wood" (ἐν ᾗ προσηλώθη τῷ ξύλῳ) (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I, 14,6). Cf. J. Schneider, ξύλον in G. Kittel's *T. W. N. T.*, 5 (1954), 36-40.

he put on incorruptibility
which no one is able
34 to take away from him.

The idea of "humbling himself unto death" (p. 20,28-29) recalls the Apostle Paul's description of Christ's "self-emptying" (κένωσις) (Phil. 2:7-8), but the thought of the Gospel of Truth refers rather to the voluntary destruction of the lower form of Christ's existence in the crucifixion. The same teaching is reiterated in the use of "divesting himself of these perishable rags" (p. 20,30-31; cf. Isaiah 64:6), a figurative way of saying that the lower form of Christ's existence in a body is brought to an end once and for all on the cross. In other words, the cross itself signifies the separation of the lower and higher form of existence for Christ, thereby giving the Gnostic the assurance of recovering the true origin of his existence in the Father. Just as the crucifixion enables Christ to become a "fruit" (ⲟⲩⲧⲁϩ) (p. 18,25) of the knowledge of the Father, it gives the true Gnostics the assurance of becoming "fruits" (p. 33,38) of the knowledge of the Father.

p. 33,35 He (= the Father) has knowledge of what
is yours, so that you may find your rest
in them. For (γάρ) from the
fruits (ⲟⲩⲧⲱⲱϩ) one has knowledge of
39 what is yours.

The Father knows that the true Gnostics are destined to find the origin of their existence in Him. This actually takes place when they themselves become "fruits" of that knowledge which is revealed to them by the Father in the cross of Christ, i.e. when they become aware of the true origin of their existence in God. The situation of the non-Gnostic, however, is exactly the opposite.

p. 28,16 For he who has no root (= the non-Gnostic)
also has no fruit (ⲟⲩⲧⲁϩ ⲁⲛ), (= does not
become aware of his true origin) but (ἀλλά)
thinks to himself:
20 "I have come into existence (in order)

> to perish by myself."
> For this reason he who does not
> exist at all (= he who is not in the foreknowledge
> of the Father) will
> 24 never come into existence.

Because the non-Gnostic has no root, he also has "no fruit" (p. 28,17-18; cf. p. 28,7-9), implying that there is no hope of his discovering the origin of his existence in the Father. Instead, he will live and die unto himself without ever really coming into existence. Therefore, because the crucifixion is the means by which Christ frees himself to the higher form of his existence, it is also the means of communicating to the Gnostic that the recovery of his true existence is now possible. This existential understanding of ⲞⲨⲦⲀϨ has nothing in common with the ten occurrences of the term "fruit" (καρπός) in the Gospel of John for the productiveness of the Christian life which results from the vital union of the believer with Christ (John 4:36; 12:24; 15:2, 4, 5, 8, and 16).

It is in this phase of the understanding of the passion of Christ in the Gospel of Truth that the contrast with the Gospel of John is most striking. The Gnostic writer completely divorces the crucifixion from its historical roots, so that it becomes merely the symbol for the separation of the lower and higher form of existence in Christ and in man. In this respect the cross is probably visualized in the shape of a "T", by which the crosspiece becomes the visual illustration for this principle of separation. A similar symbolical interpretation of the cross is found in the Epistle of Barnabas (c. A.D. 130) where in the case of 318 servants of Abraham (Gen. 14:14) the number 300 (represented by the numerical value of the letter T) points to the cross.[98] By interpreting the cross as the symbol for the separation between the lower and upper realms of existence, the historical fact of the crucifixion is overloded in favor of the existential meaning of the cross for the Gnostic. Instead of being the crowning act of the fulfilment of God's purpose in history, the cross becomes the means by which man recovers the true origin of his existence in the Father.

---

[98] The Epistle of Barnabas (IX, 8-9) reads: "What then was the knowledge (γνῶσις) given to him (= Abraham)? Notice that he first mentions the (continued next page)

The passion of Christ is the center of the Gospel story in the Gnostic homily because it is the means by which Christ is enabled to return to the true form of his existence in the Father. For this reason it also gives the Gnostic the present assurance of being absorbed into the divine, thereby enabling him to experience the fulfilment of his true existence in God. This fulfilment is expressed in the Gospel of Truth by the use of the noun "glory" (ⲈⲀⲨ) (p. 23,26; p. 38,5; p. 42,3) and the verb "to glorify" (Ϯ ⲈⲀⲨ) (p. 19,33-34; p. 41,1; p. 43,17; cf. p. 19,33). Since the crucifixion is the only aspect of the life of Christ that is prominent in the Gospel of Truth, it is the primary way in which the "glory" of the Father is manifested in the Son. It is said that "*His* (= the Father's) *glory* (ⲠⲒⲈⲀⲨ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲞⲞⲦϤ̄) has exalted him (= the *Logos*) (p. 23,26-27) ... in order that *he might glorify* (ⲚϤϮ ⲈⲀⲨ) the *Pleroma*" (p. 41,1). It is in the crucifixion that the Father "*exalted*" (ⲀϤϪⲒⲤⲈ) (p. 23,27) Christ as a manifestation of His glory. Christ in turn "glorified" the *Pleroma,* the higher world of the Father to which his death enables him to

---

(footnote 98 continued) eighteen, and after a pause the three hundred. The eighteen is I (= 10) and H (= 8) - you have Jesus - and because the cross was destined to have grace in the T he says 'and three hundred'. So he indicates Jesus in the two letters and the cross in the other. He knows this who placed the gift of his teaching in our hearts. No one has heard a more excellent lesson from me, but I know that you are worthy" - K. Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers,* Vol. I (London: Wm. Heinemann, 1925), pp. 372-373. Cf. J. J. Collins, "The Archaeology of the Crucifixion," *C. B. Q.,* 1 (1939), 154-159, and F. C. Burkitt, *Church and Gnosis: A Study of Christian Thought and Speculation in the Second Century* (Cambridge: University Press, 1932), pp. 46-47.

return. The manifestation of the "glory" of the Father in the crucifixion of the Son also has an effect on the true Gnostics.

> They came to know; they were known.
> They were glorified; they gave glory
> (p. 19,32-33; cf. John 10:14; 13:31).

The chiasmus with respect to the switching of active and passive verbs expresses the reciprocal relationship between the Father and His children. Because the crucifixion of Christ defeated Error with "knowledge" (p. 32,27), the cross becomes the means of communicating the knowledge of man's true origin in the Father. For this reason it enables the true Gnostics "to come to know" (ⲁⲩⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ) that "they were (already) known" (ⲁⲩⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛⲟⲩ) by the Father. Because the manifestation of the "glory" (p. 23,26) of the Father in the crucifixion frees Christ from the lower form of his existence, he is able to "glorify the Pleroma" (p. 41,1). Likewise the true Gnostics are able to "give glory" (ⲁⲩϯ ⲉⲁⲩ) to the Father because "they were (first) glorified" (ⲁⲩϫⲓ ⲉⲁⲩ) by Him in the process of being reabsorbed into the divine. The actual process of reabsorption is described as a manifestation of the "glory" (p. 38,5) of the Father's name.

p. 37,34 For (γάρ) He (= the Father) knows
all their beginning (= origin) and their end.
For (γάρ) at their end he will ask them
what they have done. And (δέ) the end is the
receiving of knowledge
about what is hidden, and that is the Father
p. 38,1 from whom the beginning (= origin) has come
forth (and) to whom
all those who have come out
from Him will return, and (δέ) they became manifest
5 for the glory (ⲉⲁⲩ) and
joy of His name.

It is clearly stated that man becomes aware of his true origin by the reception of knowledge which enables him to return to the Father. The means by which this knowledge is communicated is the crucifixion of Christ, and its appropriation by the true Gnostics is a manifestation of the glory of the Father's name. Moreover, the process of reabsorption is expressed negatively by the fact that the Gnostics are not deprived of "the glory of the Father" (ⲠⲈⲀⲨ ⲘⲠⲒⲰⲦ) (p. 42,3-4) and positively by the fact that the Gnostic "glorifies Him in whom he was (and still is)" (ⲈϤϮ ⲈⲀⲨ ⲘⲠⲈⲦⲈⲚⲈϤϢⲞⲞⲠ) (p. 43,17-18). Therefore, the crucifixion is interpreted in the Gospel of Truth as the glorification of Christ and as the means of glorification for man. For this reason there is no need for the resurrection of Christ in the Gnostic homily since it is by the humiliation of the cross that Christ sets himself free from the lower form of his existence and returns to the higher form of his existence in the Father. Therefore, the passion of Christ is all that is necessary to communicate the knowledge of man's true origin in the Father and by itself is the way in which the true Gnostic is reabsorbed into the divine.

The idea of glorification in the Gospel of Truth also reflects the influence of the Gospel of John. For John the cross is more than an act of humiliation; it is also an act of exaltation by which God manifests His glory in the life of His Son (John 13:31). The Johannine use of ὑψοῦν (John 3:14; 8:28; 12:32 and 34) is found in the Gospel of Truth as the equivalent Coptic verb "to exalt" (Ⲣ̄ϪⲒⲤⲈ) (p. 23,27). The Johannine use of δοξάζειν (John 15:8; 17:1; 21:19) is found in the Gospel of Truth as the equivalent Coptic verb "to glorify" (Ⲣ̄Ϯ ⲈⲀⲨ) (p. 41,1), assuming that its object (= the Pleroma) refers not to the many lesser inhabitants of the higher world (= the Aeons or emanations) but to the one great Inhabitant (= the Father). The author of the Gospel of Truth, however, does not use either term in a double meaning. The verb Ⲣ̄ϪⲒⲤⲈ refers only to the exaltation of the "crucifixion," not to the exaltation of the "ascension." In the same way the verb ⲣ̄ϯ ⲉⲁⲩ refers only to the glorification of the "crucifixion," not to the glorification of the "resurrection." The passion of Christ in itself is the only aspect of the life of Christ which has significance for the Gnostic. The contrast with John is even greater when the idea of glorification is applied to man. In the Fourth Gospel Christ gives the "glory" (John 17:22) of the Father to his disciples, so that they may apprehend the perfect fulfilment of the Father's work in his crucifixion.

> The glory (δόξα) which thou hast given me
> I have given to them, that they may be one even as
> we are one (John 17:22).

Because the redemptive work of Christ reveals the purpose of the Father, Christ enables his disciples to know this purpose and to share in its consummation with him in perfect unity with the Father in heaven. The idea that Christ gives the "glory" of the Father to his followers in the crucifixion is reinterpreted in the Gospel of Truth to mean that Christ communicates the knowledge of man's true origin in the Father by his crucifixion. Therefore, it is in the process of man's reabsorption into the divine that the glory of the Father is manifested. The Johannine teaching of the glorification of Christ in the disgrace of the cross is clearly accepted by the author of the Gospel of Truth. Yet he loses sight of the actual suffering and agony of Christ in the act of humiliation and emphasizes only the symbolical meaning of the cross as an act of exaltation. In this respect the cross is no longer the climax of God's work in history but is transformed into a symbol for the illumination of man's origin in the Father.

It now becomes clear that the redemptive work of Christ in the Gospel of Truth is carried out by a heavenly messenger. The basic presupposition underlying the way of salvation in the Gnostic homily is that the Father created man and, therefore, desires for him to know the true state of his divine origin. Since the work of Error brings about a state of forgetfulness in which men are ignorant of their origin, the appearance of Christ as God's messenger awakens or sets in motion the divine root of man's existence in the Father. Therefore, it is the mere appearance of Christ that is redemptive. This is why the work of Christ in the Gospel of Truth is understood as that of a "heavenly messenger." He is a "messenger" in that he communicates the knowledge of man's divine origin in the Father by his death on the cross. He can be described as "heavenly" because he appears as an emanation from the Father who submits himself to the crucifixion in order to set himself free to the true form of his existence in God.

The contrast between the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth with respect to the redemptive work of Christ is completely missed when the emphasis is put on the literary comparison of certain key words, such as "Saviour,""sent," "light," "teacher," "cross," and "glorify." The use of similar language does not mean that the two documents reflect a similar interpretation of the way of salvation. In the Gospel of John the redemptive work which Christ performs is the identification of himself with the sin of man as an earthly Saviour; in the Gospel of Truth it is the illumination of the ignorance of man as a heavenly messenger. Nevertheless, it is surprising that the pivotal point in both instances is the role which Jesus Christ plays in the total process of salvation. The difference between these two interpretations of the work of Christ is a logical outgrowth of their particular understanding of the predicament of man and prepares the way for their respective interpretations of the appropriation of eternal life.

III. THE APPROPRIATION OF ETERNAL LIFE

The entire history of God's saving activity is directed toward the need of man. In the Gospel of John man is a slave to sin, and his condition of rebellion against God is overcome by believing in the redemptive work of Christ. In the Gospel of Truth man is a victim of Error, and his condition of forgetfulness is overcome by the knowledge of his divine origin which is revealed by Christ. In both documents the final result is called "eternal life." For John eternal life is appropriated by faith and knowledge and expresses itself in love; for the Gnostic writer it is appropriated by knowledge alone and also finds expression in love.

(1) Faith. Man's appropriation of salvation in the Fourth Gospel is primarily a matter of believing on Christ.[99] Although the noun "faith" (πίστις) does not occur in the Gospel of John (cf. 1 John 5:4), the adjective "faithful" (πιστός) (John 20:27) occurs once and the verb "to believe" (πιστεύειν) occurs ninety-nine times. This verb is obviously one of the most important terms in John's vocabulary since it provides the key to the way in which salvation is appropriated by man. The importance of the term πιστεύειν will become apparent in a discussion of its varied use in the Fourth Gospel and of its bearing upon the related ideas of knowledge, love, and life. The meaning of faith in Christ is, therefore, a cohesive element that binds

---

[99] R. Bultmann, "Faith" in *Bible Key Words*, Vol. III, Part 1 (1960), 57-110, esp. 97-110. Cf. A. Schlatter, *Der Glaube im Neuen Testament: Eine Untersuchung zur neutestamentlichen Theologie* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1885), S. 165-208; G. B. Stevens, *op. cit.*, pp. 218-240; P. H. Menoud, "La foi dans l'Évangile de Jean," *Cah. Bib.*, I (1936), 27-43; W. G. Kümmel, "Der Glaube im Neuen Testament," *Th. Bl.*, 16 (1938), 209-221; W. F. Howard, *op. cit.*, pp. 151-173; and C. H. Dodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 179-186.

together much of the diversity of Johannine thought.

Some important varieties of grammatical construction are contained in John's use of πιστεύειν. Except for John 2:24 the verb is always used intransitively and usually has reference to Jesus as its object. The one transitive use of the verb is the only instance in which Jesus stands as the subject: "Jesus did not entrust (οὐκ ἐπίστευεν) himself to them" (John 2:24). The intransitive use is predominent in the Fourth Gospel and has four main meanings. a) πιστεύειν occurs eleven times with a ὅτι - clause and means to believe intellectually in the sense of "being convinced" that Jesus is the Son of God. The ὅτι - clause occurs as "that I am" (John 8:24; 13:19), "that thou didst send me" (John 11:42; 17:8 and 21), "that I am in the Father" (John 14:10 and 11), "that you are the Christ" (John 11:27), "that Jesus is the Christ" (John 20:31), "that I came from the Father" (John 16:27), and "that you came from God" (John 16:30). Each of these clauses makes up the content of belief about Christ, and in every instance this content is related to the nature, the mission, and the status of Christ. Thus, πιστεύειν with a ὅτι - clause pertains to the intellectual acceptance of the work of God in Jesus Christ. b) πιστεύειν occurs eighteen times with the dative and means merely to believe in the sense of "giving credence to" what Jesus says and does. The dative refers to the person of Christ by the pronouns "me" (John 4:21; 8:45 and 46; 9:37 and 38; 10:37; 14:11), "you" (John 6:30), and "him" (John 5:24; 8:31); it refers to what Jesus says as the "word" (John 2:22; 4:50) and "words" (John 5:47); it refers to what Jesus does as "works" (John 10:38). The dative also has reference to the Father as "Him who sent me" (John 5:24), to "Moses" (John 5:46) and "his writing" (John 5:47), and to "our report" (John 12:38; cf. Isaiah

53:1). In the Fourth Gospel this usage has the connotation of "confidence" which expresses itself in giving credence to the words and works of Christ. Because the personal element is also included, it merges quite naturally with the next usage. c) πιστεύειν occurs thirty-five times with εἰς plus the accusative and means to trust in the sense of "personally having confidence in" Christ as the Saviour. The object of the preposition occurs as "Jesus" (John 12:11), "the Son" (John 3:36), "the Son of Man" (John 9:32), "him whom He has sent" (John 6:29), "Him who sent me" (John 12:44), "his name" (John 1:12; 2:23; 3:18), "light" (John 12:36) and "God" (John 14:1). The most frequent use of the idiom refers to Jesus simply with the pronouns "me" (John 6:35; 7:38; 11:25 and 26; 12:44 and 46; 14:1 and 12; 16:9; 17:20) and "him" (John 2:11; 3:16 and 18; 4:39; 6:40; 7:5, 31, 39, and 48; 8:30; 9:36; 9:42; 11:45 and 48; 12:37 and 42). The contrast between the use of πιστεύειν with the dative and with εἰς plus the accusative is the difference between mere belief which accepts the words of Christ without any wavering of doubt and personal trust which acknowledges absolute allegiance to Christ as a slave to his master. The latter use of the term is the distinctive contribution of the New Testament and receives its fullest expression in the Gospel of John. d) πιστεύειν occurs thirty-four times in the absolute sense and usually means to have faith in the sense of "accepting the Christian message concerning Jesus." This absolute use of πιστεύειν provides the basis for the all-inclusive invitation of the early Church for men to come to Christ. John makes it clear that "whosoever has faith (πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων) in him may have eternal life" (John 3:51; cf. John 11:26). The desire of John the Baptist is that "all might believe (πάντες πιστεύσωσιν) through him" (John 1:17), i.e. that all might come to have faith because of his witness to Christ. This usage also illustrates the way in which men respond to the invitation. For example, the nobleman "himself believed (ἐπίστευσεν αὐτός) and all his household" (John 4:53b; cf. Acts 16:34), i.e. he became a Christian by having faith in Christ. Finally, this usage shows how men come to Christ when the opportunity of "seeing" him on earth is no longer possible (John 4:48; 6:36, 40, and 46-47; 20:8 and 25). Just as many had faith because of seeing Christ's glory on earth (John 11:40), faith remains the capacity for seeing his glory when he is no longer visible to the human eye (John 20:29). Thus, Christ becomes contemporary to every generation as men accept the Christian message by faith.

Although John insists upon the necessity of "believing on Christ" in an act of personal trust as the basis for accepting the gospel message, he does not separate this from the opportunity of "coming to know God through Christ" in the act of "sharing his love" in a life of obedience. Therefore, the full meaning of faith in the Fourth Gospel must be seen in its relation to knowledge and love.

(a) Faith and Knowledge. Like πίστις , John avoids the use of the noun γνῶσις in favor of fifty-six occurrences of the verb "to know" (γινώσκειν).[100] When the use of γινώσκειν is supplemented by the eighty-five occurrences of the related verb οἶδα ,[101] the impression might be given that John is more interested in the use of

---

[100] R. Bultmann, "Gnosis" in *Bible Key Words*, Vol. II, Part 2 (1952), pp. 1-67, esp. 45-50. Cf. M. R. Ely, *Knowledge of God in Johannine Thought* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1925); R. M. Pope, "Faith and Knowledge in Pauline and Johannine Thought," *Exp. Tim.*, 41 (1929/30), 421-427; J. Huby, "De la connaissance de foi dans Saint Jean," *Rech. Sc. Rel.*, 2 (1931), 385-421; R. P. Casey, "Gnosis, Gnosticism and the New Testament" in C. H. Dodd's *Festschrift* (1956), pp. 52-80; and C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 151-169.

"knowledge" (which occurs 141 times) than of "faith" (which occurs 99 times). A glance at the main uses of γινώσκειν in the Fourth Gospel, however, will reveal that these two aspects of man's appropriation of eternal life are actually inseparable. The verb γινώσκειν occurs with several of the same ὅτι - clauses that are used with πιστεύειν, i.e. "that I am" (John 8:28), "that I am in the Father" (John 14:20), and "that thou didst send me" (John 17:25; cf. John 7:17). Instead of πιστεύειν with the dative and εἰς plus the accusative, the verb γινώσκειν is used frequently with a direct object. The object refers to the Father as "Him" (John 14:7c), "Thee" (John 17:3a, 25a, and 25b), "the Father" (John 10:15b), and "my Father" (John 14:7b). It refers to Christ as "him" (John 1:10; 2:24), "me" (John 1:49; 10:14b and 15a; 14:7a and 9), and "Jesus Christ" (John 17:3b). It is significant that faith is largely directed toward Jesus (except in John 12:14 and 14:1 where it is also directed toward God), while the object of knowledge is both the Father and Jesus (except in John 14:7 where it is also the Holy Spirit). This shifting of emphasis from the intransitive use of πιστεύειν with reference to Jesus to the transitive use of γινώσκειν with reference to Jesus and the Father is quite striking. Nevertheless, this difference is largely grammatical since John does not think in terms of theoretical knowledge of propositions about God

---

[101] R. Bultmann, "Gnosis," *op. cit.*, p. 30, note 1, and C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John* (London: S. P. C. K., 1956), p. 135, argue convincingly that there is no basic difference in meaning between γινώσκειν and εἰδέναι. Therefore, the present discussion will be limited to the Johannine use of γινώσκειν. Cf. E. A. Abbott, *Johannine Vocabulary*, pp. 120-125; P. Thomson, "'Know' in the New Testament," *Exp.*, *9th Series*, *3* (1925), 379-382; and E. K. Lee, *op. cit.*, pp. 233-234, for the view which makes a distinction between the Johannine use of the two verbs.

or Christ but in terms of knowing them personally. The use of the verb γινώσκειν in connection with this personal knowledge of the Father and the Son is foremost in John's thought. The only reference to knowledge of any other person occurs in connection with Nathanael (John 1:48).

The Johannine understanding of "knowledge" has four main usages. a) γινώσκειν occurs seventeen times with reference to the knowledge of God which is revealed by Christ, four of which are expressed positively (John 6:69; 14:31; 17:3 and 23) and thirteen of which are expressed negatively (John 1:10; 3:10; 8:27, 43, and 55; 10:6; 12:16; 13:12 and 28; 14:9 and 17; 16:3; 17:25). The verbs πιστεύειν and γινώσκειν are used together in the statement of Simon Peter:

> We have believed (πεπιστεύκαμεν) and have come to know (ἐγνώκαμεν) that you are the Holy One of God (John 6:69; cf. John 10:38).

Here faith is man's first turning to the revelation of God in Christ, and it is followed by knowledge. The reverse order is also possible in which faith becomes the attitude arising out of knowledge (John 17:8; cf. John 16:30). This means that it is impossible to distinguish between πιστεύειν and γινώσκειν merely as the initial and final stages of salvation. Instead, faith and knowledge are inseparably related to one another in the total process of salvation. John teaches that it is by believing on Christ that man is introduced to the glory of God which is inaccessible apart from faith (John 11:40). Not all men, however, come to know God because receiving this knowledge is a matter of understanding and rightly valuing what Jesus teaches (John 7:17). God cannot be known by those who are "from below" and who are "of this world" (John 8:23) or by those who are "not of God" (John 8:47) but who are "of their father the Devil" (John 8:44). Nevertheless, John emphasizes that it is God's desire to be known by all men and that man's salvation is dependent upon faith in Christ and upon the true knowledge of God which is revealed by him. b) γινώσκειν occurs seven times with reference to the mediatory position of Christ, three of which refer to his knowledge of God (John 10:15; 17:25) and four of which refer to his knowledge of man (John 2:25; 10:14 and 27). It is because Christ knows the Father that he can make Him known to man (John 10:15). Jesus makes this clear when he prays,

> O righteous Father, the world has not known (οὐκ ἔγνω) Thee, but I have known (ἔγνων) Thee, and these know (ἔγνωσαν) that Thou hast sent me (John 17:25).

Although the world does not know God, the Son who from eternity has been in the bosom of the Father knows Him and makes Him known (John 1:10 and 18). The disciples thus know that Christ is the authorized agent and revealer of God and that God has chosen to mediate His knowledge to man through the one whom He has sent into the world. Therefore, it is through the Incarnation of the *Logos* which is consummated in his death and resurrection that the knowledge of God is brought to man in its definitive form. c) γινώσκειν occurs fifteen times with reference to the possibility of man's reception of the knowledge of God through Christ, five of which take place in the present (John 10:14; 14:7a; 17:7-8 and 25) and ten of which take place in the future (John 7:17; 8:28 and 32; 10:38, 13:7; 14:7bc, 17, and 20). The importance which John places on man's reception of the knowledge of God in Christ is revealed in the words of Jesus:

> If you have come to know (ἐγνώκατε) me (as you have done), you shall know (γνώσεσθε) my Father also; from this moment you know (γινώσκετε) Him and have seen Him (John 14:7).[102]

---

[102] This variant reading of ℵ D makes the verse a promise concerning the present and future possession of the knowledge of God by man. The reading (continued next page)

To know Jesus in this sense does not mean to have accurate historical information about his earthly life but to be aware of his oneness with the Father (John 14:20; cf. John 10:38) and to be obedient to his demands (John 14:21). Jesus also ways, "You will know (γνώσεσθε) the truth, and the truth will make you free" (John 8:32; cf. John 8:28). In this connection the expression "being made free" means that man is delivered from the bondage of sin and is, therefore, a synonym for "being saved." This deliverance is possible because of the gift of Christ to the world which is the revelation of "the truth." It is not enough that the truth which is the light shines upon men; it must be received by an act of the will in the expression of faith. Yet this element of moral choice presupposes that one knows the truth in which he believes. For this reason knowing God is closely related to and cannot be separated from believing on Christ (John 17:3; cf. 1 John 3:6). Thus, faith includes the apprehension of a true knowledge of God's revelation in Christ. d) γινώσκειν occurs seventeen times as an expression of the knowledge of facts. The subject of the verb appears with reference to "Christ" (John 4:1; 5:6 and 42; 6:15; 16:19; 21:17), "the nobleman" (John 4:53), "the rulers" (John 7:26), "the crowd" (John 7:49; 12:9; 19:4; cf. John 7:51; 15:18), "the Jews" (John 8:52), "anyone" (John 11:57), and "all men" (John 13:35). The relationship between knowledge of facts and believing in a person is illustrated by the healing of the nobleman's son.

(footnote 102 continued), of BCL etc. (ἐγνώκειτε - ᾔδειτε) and of A Θ text.rec. (ἐγνώκειτε - ἐγνώκειτε) also make good sense if the verse is understood as a reproach, i.e. "If you had known me (and though you ought to have done so, you do not), you would have known my Father also." The former reading fits the present context much better since "from this moment" (ἀπ' ἄρτι) points to the future time when Jesus will have completed the revelation of the Father (cf. John 19:30). The latter readings may be accounted for as an assimilation of John 14:7 to the thought of John 8:19. Cf. C. K. Barrett, op. cit., pp. 382-383, and C. H. Dodd, op. cit., pp. 164-165.

> The father (= the nobleman) *knew* (ἔγνω) that was the hour when Jesus had said to him, "Your son will live"; and he himself *believed* (ἐπίστευσεν) and all his household (John 4:53).

In this case the knowledge of "signs and wonders" (John 4:48) leads to faith in Christ. Therefore, the "knowledge" which is revealed by Christ provides the basis for understanding which is necessary for "faith," both of which enable man to enter into a personal relationship with God. This relationship does not remain a state of mind but expresses itself in attitudes and deeds of love. The fact that faith produces appropriate moral fruit in love calls for a consideration of this ethical dimension of John's thought.

(b) Faith and Love. Since John understands Jesus to be "the Saviour of the world" and not just a moral teacher, it is quite natural that the ethical teaching of the Fourth Gospel is an outgrowth of man's faith in Christ. For John the whole conception of Christian morality is contained in the word "love." It occurs seven times as the noun ἀγάπη (John 5:42; 13:35; 15:9, 10, and 13; 17:26) and thirty-seven times as the verb ἀγαπᾶν (e.g. John 13:34; 14:15, 21, and 23; 15:12).[103] Man comes to know Christ by faith in the experience of accepting the love of God which is revealed by Christ, and man returns this love by expressing his faith in a life of obedience.

The true criterion of Christian love is nothing other than the love of God for the world which led to the mission of the Incarnate Christ (John 3:16 and 35) and which reached its climax in his supreme sacrifice on the cross (John 15:13; cf. John 10:11). Anders Nygren gives the classic expression to this view when he says,

---

[103] E. Stauffer, "Love" in *Bible Key Words*, Vol. I, Part 1 (1951), pp. 45-67, esp. 61-63. Cf. J. B. Stevens, *op. cit.*, pp. 266-289; R. Frieling, *Agape: Die göttliche Liebe im Johannes-Evangelium* (Stuttgart: Verlag Urachhaus, 1936); C. R. Bowen, "Love in the Fourth Gospel," *J. Rel.*, 13 (1933), 39-49; J. Moffatt, Love in the New Testament (London: Hodder, 1929), pp. 251-308; and J. O. Buswell, "The Ethics of 'Believe' in the Fourth Gospel," *Bib. Sac.*, 80 (1952), 28-37.

> The Agape that is required here has its prototype in the Agape manifested by God, and therefore it must be spontaneous and unmotivated, uncalculating, unlimited, and unconditional.[104]

This means that man's love to man is determined by God's love to man and that all Christian love is actually a response to the self-giving love of God which is revealed in the sacrifice of His Son. Thus, love in the heart of the believer is awakened by divine love and expresses itself in love of the brethren. Christ illustrates the meaning of Christian love by giving the disciples an "example" (ὑπόδειγμα) (John 13:15) in the incident of the foot-washing which is a prelude to its climactic manifestation on the cross. Then he interprets the meaning of Christian love in the light of the second great commandment of the Law (Lev. 19:18).

> A new commandment I give unto you, that you love (ἀγαπᾶτε) one another; even as I have loved (ἠγάπησα) you, that you also love (ἀγαπᾶτε) one another. By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love (ἀγάπην) one to another (John 13:34-35; cf. John 15:12).

The new feature of this commandment is found in the words "even as I have loved you" (John 13:34b). The old commandment was weak because it lacked a personal example of its meaning and the motive power to follow this example. Christ shows the true meaning of love for one another in the concrete example of the foot-washing ceremony, thereby foreshadowing the supreme example of the crucifixion. It is the quality of Christ condescending, sacrificial love that is to be the model for that of his disciples in their relations with each other. This commandment of "love" (ἀγάπη)

---

[104] A. Nygren, *Agape and Eros* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953), p. 91. The noun ἀγάπη and its cognate verb ἀγαπᾶν form the heart of John's understanding of Christian love. The noun φιλία does not occur in the Fourth Gospel (cf. James 4:4), but its cognate verb φιλεῖν occurs thirteen times and is used interchangeably with ἀγαπᾶν (e.g. John 5:20; 11:3 and 36; 20:2; 21:15-17). The related noun "friend" (φίλος) is probably a technical term for "Christian" (John 11:11; 15:13-14; cf. 3 John 15).

(John 13:35) calls for more than the emotion of brotherly affection; it requires a steady, disciplined will to seek the good of others. Christ enables men to practice the true meaning of love by supplying them with the power and inspiration to follow his example. He describes the motive power as "loving me" or "abiding in my love."

> If you love me (ἀγαπᾶτέ με), you will keep my commandments.... He that has my commandments and keeps them, he it is that loves me (ἀγαπῶν με) .... If any man loves me (ἀγαπᾷ με), he will keep my word (John 14:15, 21a, and 23a).

> Even as the Father has loved me, I also have loved you: abide in my love (μείνατε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ) If you keep my commandments, you shall abide in my love (μενεῖτε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ μου); even as I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in his love (John 15:9-10).

The love of Christ is thus the atmosphere in which the disciple lives. It is not something that is limited to a momentary crisis but something that is enjoyed continuously. This relationship to Christ produces an attitude of the mind which must necessarily manifest itself in outward deeds. In other words, Christian love expresses the conduct resulting from the obedience and loyalty of faith. This obedience is referred to as "keeping my commandments" (John 14:15 and 21; 15:10) and "keeping my word" (John 8:51-52; 14:23-24; 15:20; 17:6). Because Agape means completely reckless self-giving, it also demands unlimited devotion. For this reason obedience is the necessary consequence of true Christian love.

Whereas faith and knowledge are largely connected with the will and intellect of man, love is related to the emotion of man and demands expression in outward actions. These three aspects of man's appropriation of salvation in the Fourth Gospel enable him to enter into a relationship with God which is described as "eternal life."

(c) Faith and Life. Eternal life in the Fourth Gospel is both a present possession and a future hope of man. This true kind of existence which God makes available to every man through faith in Christ is referred to thirty-six times as "life" (ζωή), of which seventeen occur as "eternal life" (ζωὴ αἰώνιος).[105] Both expressions mean essentially the same thing, i.e. the "spiritual" life which is given by God to man in response to his belief in Christ. Moreover, there are also seventeen occurrences of the verb "to live" (ζῆν). The relationship between faith and life is expressed in the statement of John's purpose for writing his Gospel:

> These (signs) are written *that you may believe* (ἵνα πιστεύητε) *that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life* (ζωὴν ἔχητε) *in his name* (John 20:31).

In the Fourth Gospel a believing relationship with Christ is the basic prerequisite for participation in life (John 3:15, 16, and 36; 5:24; 6:40 and 47; 11:26; cf. 1 John 5:12-13). The same intimate relationship with Christ is also expressed in terms of knowledge and life.

> And this is *eternal life* (ἡ αἰώνιος ζωή), *that they may know* (ἵνα γινώσκωσιν) Thee, *the only true God,* and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent (John 17:3).

The appropriation of eternal life is inseparably connected with the knowledge of the purpose of God in sending His Son into the world and the acceptance of Christ by faith as the Son of God. Faith is so closely related to knowledge because both are rooted in the historical person of Jesus Christ and both make up the way of entering into eternal life.

---

[105] R. Bultmann, ζάω, ζωή in G. Kittel's *T. W. N. T.*, 2 (1935), 862-877, insbes. 871-874. Cf. G. B. Stevens, *op. cit.*, pp. 312-327; J. Gurney Hoare, *"Life" in St. John's Gospel* (London: S. P. C. K., 1901); J. Frey, "Le concept de vie dans Saint Jean," *Bib.*, 1 (1920), 38-58 et 213-239; D. B. Lyons, *The Concept of Eternal Life in the Gospel According to St. John* (Washington: Catholic University Press, 1938); E. K. Lee, *op. cit.*, pp. 191-219; Franz Muszner, ΖΩΗ : *Die Anschauung vom "Leben" im vierten Evangelium unter Berücksichtigung der Johannesbriefe: Ein Beitrag zur biblischen Theologie* (München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1952); C. H. Dodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 144-150; Alf Corell, *Consummatum Est: Eschatology and Church in the Gospel of St. John* (London: S. P. C. K., 1958), pp. 128-150; and Floyd V. Filson, "The Gospel of Life: A Study of the Gospel of John" in Otto A. Piper's *Festschrift* (1962), pp. 111-123.

Although eternal life is clearly the goal toward which faith and knowledge lead man, the actualization of this goal is not limited to the fulfilment of an eschatological hope for the future; it is already a present possession in the life of the believer. John shares with the Synoptic Gospels the expectation of a future coming of Christ as the basis of man's hope for the inheritance of eternal life (John 5:29; 12:25; 14:19). He prefers, however, to emphasize the fact that the believer already possesses the true quality of life here on this earth. The main purpose of the mission of Christ is to give life to the world (John 6:33; 10:10 and 28), and man receives this life as a result of his faith in Christ (John 3:36; 6:47; 5:40). In this connection Rudolf Bultmann limits his understanding of ζωή in the Fourth Gospel to this "de-mythologized" present eschatology and eliminates all the references to a futuristic eschatology as being later editorial insertions.

> ζωή is acquired not in relation to an idea or to a supratemporal, metaphysical being but in believing attachment to an historical fact and an historical person, and it consists accordingly of the "How" of historical existence in the resoluteness by means of the revealed Word which learns to understand the present moment as free from the past and open to the future; it is at the same time the way and the goal.[106]

---

[106] R. Bultmann, ζάω, ζωή in G. Kittel's *T. W. N. T.*, 2 (1935), 873. The same one-sided emphasis on a "demythologized" present eschatology is found in R. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, S. 171, 174-176, und 196. which systematically separates the future from the present in such a way that no room remains for a futuristic eschatological event. The fact that the raising of the body of the believer takes place only at the last day is ignored by discarding all the Johannine passages that speak of the resurrection at the end (John 6:39, 40, 44, and 54; cf. John 5:29).

John, however, clearly views the present privilege and the eschatological hope together (John 5:24-25; 11:25-26). The relationship between the present and future aspects of life is placed in the proper perspective by the resurrection of Christ.

> Jesus said to her (= Martha), "I am the resurrection and the life; he who believes in me, even if he die, shall live (ζήσεται), and whosoever lives (ζῶν) and believes in me shall never die" (John 11:25-26; cf. John 14:6).

The two aspects of life are contained in the present ζῶν and the future ζήσεται , and the relationship between them is found in "the resurrection" (ἡ ἀνάστασις) (cf. John 5:29; 6:39-40, 44, and 54; 20:9). The resurrection of Christ connects his earthly life with his life as the glorified Lord and molds these two "lives" into one unity which cannot be dissolved. In the same way the earthly life of the one who believes in Christ is inseparably linked up with his life in the world to come. Thus, man lives a real life with both body and soul here on this earth and hereafter in eternity.

The Johannine understanding of life is closely connected with the term "eternal" (αἰώνιος) (John 3:15, 16, and 36; 4:14 and 36; 5:24 and 39; 6:27, 40, 47, 54, and 68; 10:28; 12:25 and 50; 17:2 and 3; cf. 1 John 1:2; 2:25). It emphasizes the source and nature of the life which it describes rather than its continuation. Since it is a qualitative rather than a quantitative term, it refers to life which cannot be measured by time rather than an endless duration of being. The meaning of the term is brought into sharper focus when it is seen in contrast to "perishing" and "death." In two passages the adjective "eternal" is contrasted with the verb "to perish," i.e. to suffer the inevitable fate of destruction because of separation from God.

> For God so loved the world that he gave His only Son, that whosoever believes in him should not perish (μὴ ἀπόληται) but have eternal life.... And I give them (= my sheep) eternal life, and they shall never perish (οὐ μὴ ἀπόλωνται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα), and no one shall snatch them out of my hand (John 3:16; 10:28).

There is no neutral ground between perishing and possessing eternal life; they are absolute alternatives. The same contrast is found in another passage in which the adjective "eternal" is set over against the noun "death," i.e. the moral death which is caused by sin.

> Truly, truly, I say to you, He who hears my word and believes him who sent me, has eternal life; he does not come into judgment, but has passed from death (ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου) into life (John 5:24; cf. I John 3:14).

Death and life are totally different spheres of existence. Life denotes the realization of man's true destiny through faith in Christ. This means that the believer has already passed out of the world ruled by death and entered into the realm of eternal life. For this reason death can claim no dominion over him (John 8:51-52) because man passes through physical death unharmed (John 11:25; cf. John 6:50, 51, and 58). Against this background death is powerless and no longer fills the faithful with fear. Only when death involves the loss of real life (that is, eternal life) is it something terrible. Therefore, eternal life is not primarily the continuation of existence apart from death but the attainment of the true goal of man's being in fellowship with God where there is no death. The attainment of this goal is begun when life is received from Christ by faith, and it is fulfilled in the world to come when the believer receives "the resurrection of life" (John 5:29).

Having considered the part which man plays with respect to the appropriation of eternal life in the Gospel of John, the path is clear for a consideration of man's role in the process of salvation in the Gospel of Truth. It becomes apparent at once that the Gnostic writer makes no use of the Johannine teaching concerning the necessity of "believing on Christ" and that he reinterprets John's understanding of "knowing the Father." John can speak quite freely about the knowledge of God because he keeps it in perfect balance with faith in Christ, both of which make possible the appropriation of eternal life (John 3:16; 17:3; 20:31). The center of emphasis is shifted in the Gospel of Truth away from man's response of faith which enables him to know God in Christ to man's capacity for knowledge which enables him to become aware of his true existence in the Father.

(2) Knowledge. The appropriation of salvation in the Gospel of Truth is primarily a matter of man's knowledge of his true self through introspection.[107] Unlike John, this teaching is contained in twenty occurrences of the noun "knowledge" (ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ), and it is supplemented with eight occurrences of the verb "to know" (ⲣ̄ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ). The understanding of "knowledge" in the Gospel of Truth is contained in four distinct usages which have much in common with the teaching of the Gospel of John.

a) ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ occurs twelve times with reference to the knowledge of man's existence in the Father which is made available through Christ, ten of which are expressed positively (ⲣ̄ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ - p. 18,7; p. 19,13;

---

[107] M. Cramer, "Zur Deutung des Ausdruckes 'Gnosis' im Evangelium Veritatis," *S. B. O.*, 3 (1958), 48-56. The important place which the Gospel of Truth gives to knowledge in the appropriation of eternal life is a typical feature of Valentinian Gnosis: "Knowledge of the unspeakable Greatness is itself perfect redemption. For since both defect and passion flowed from ignorance, the whole substance of what was thus formed is destroyed by knowledge; and therefore, knowledge is the redemption of the inner man.... The redemption must, therefore, be of a spiritual nature; for ... the inner and spiritual man is redeemed by means of knowledge, and having acquired the knowledge of all things, stands thenceforth in need of nothing else. This, then, is the true redemption" (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I, 21,4). Cf. E. F. Scott, "Gnosticism" in J. Hastings's *E. R. E.*, 5 (1912), 231-242; W. Bousset, "Gnosis, Gnostiker" in Pauly-Wissowa's *R. E.*, 7 (1912), 1503-1547; R. P. Casey, "The Study of Gnosticism," *J. T. S.*, 36 (1935), 45-60; and Frederik Torm, "Das Wort γνωστικός," *Z. N. T. W.*, 35 (1936), 70-75.

p. 24,16; p. 26,29; p. 27,11; ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ - p. 19,6; p. 22,36 and 38; p. 23,21; p. 30,23-24) and two of which are expressed negatively (ⲣ̄ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ - p. 31,3-4; ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ - p. 19,16). The positive understanding of "knowledge" in the Gospel of Truth is based upon the fact that the Father Himself desires to be known. This desire is expressed in a difficult passage which considers the human situation of man's desire to be known by his offspring as analogous to that of the divine.

p. 19,10 Just as a man who has
many offspring (lit. forth through him)
who are ignorant of him
desires to be known (ⲁⲧⲣⲟⲩⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛϥ̄) and
14 loved by them, (so the Father desires) thus (to
be known and loved).

The use of the verb "to be known" in the passive voice (p. 19,13) implies that God desires all men who are capable of knowledge to realize their true existence in Him. Although man's vision of God is temporarily blinded by forgetfulness, the Father's desire "to be known" causes Him to bring "knowledge" into existence in order that forgetfulness might be destroyed and that the Father "might be known" (ⲛⲥⲉⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛϥ̄) (p. 18,7). This is possible because "His (= the Father's) knowledge has revealed [him] (= the Logos) (ⲡⲓⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ̄ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲁⲛϩ̄[ϥ̄] ⲁⲃⲁⲗ) (p. 23,21-22; cf. p. 24,16), i.e. His knowledge is communicated by means of the divine messenger, Jesus Christ. Here "knowledge" is one of the attributes of the Father which is made available to man by the Logos. The same idea is expressed in more detail in another passage which refers to Christ not as the Logos but as the Son.

p. 24,11 He (= the Father)
reveals His hidden self -
His hidden self is
His Son - in order that (ἵνα)
15 the Aeons (αἰών) may know Him (ⲛⲥⲉⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛϥ̄)
through the mercies of the Father
and stop taking pains to search for

> the Father (and) find their rest (lit. rest themselves)
> in Him, since they know
> 20 that this is (indeed) the Rest.

Here the Father gives expression to "His hidden self" (= the depth of His thought and mind) in the form of His Son in order that the Aeons may come to know Him. Both passages lose sight of the redemptive work of Christ and merely view him as a divine messenger who conveys the knowledge of man's true existence in God. The work of the Holy Spirit is described as making "the knowledge from the Father (ⲠⲒⲤⲀⲨⲚⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲘ̄ ⲠⲒⲰⲦ) and the appearance of His Son" (p. 30,23-25) available to man, thereby giving man the power to arouse out of the sleep of ignorance and to attain the self-realization of true existence in the Father. The communication of this knowledge takes place within the cosmological framework of "the All" (ⲠⲦⲎⲢϤ̄) which includes all human creatures as well as all supernatural beings and all created things (p. 23,35).[108] In the Gospel of Truth the Father desires that "the Aeons" (ⲚⲒⲀⲒⲰⲚ) (p. 24,17; cf. p. 19,6; p. 22,36 and 38), "the emanations" (ⲚⲒϯⲎ) (p. 26,29), and the "spaces" (ϨⲚ̄ⲘⲀⲈⲒⲦ) (p. 27,10-11) all come to know their true existence in Him. This kind of cosmic redemption is reminiscent of the thought of the Apostle Paul (Col. 1:17; Rom. 11:26; 1 Cor. 8:6; Eph. 4:6) but is foreign to the thought of John.

---

[108] The designation of the universe as "the All" (ⲠⲦⲎⲢϤ̄) occurs twenty times in the Gospel of Truth (p. 17,5-7; p. 18,34-38; p. 19,8-9 and 15; p. 20,2 and 18-19; p. 21,9-10 and 19-20; p. 23,35; p. 24,3 and 5; p. 43,5). This does not include the adverbial use of ⲠⲦⲎⲢϤ̄ as "at all" (p. 25,22) and of πάντως as "certainly" (p. 39,28-29). This Gnostic term has its roots in the Johannine use of "all things" (πάντα) (John 1:3) which encompasses a larger cosmological dimension than the expression ὁ κόσμος. Whereas "the world" refers just to the totality of human creatures, "all things" also refers to the totality of the universe. The Gnostic writer elaborates on the Johannine idea of πάντα by describing the inhabitants of the universe as the "Aeons," the "emanations" of truth, and the "spaces" who become aware of their origin in God through the communication of knowledge by Christ.

The negative understanding of the "knowledge" of the Father occurs with reference to "the All" (p. 19,16) and the non-Gnostics (p. 31,3-4). In the course of acknowledging that the Father calls man back to Himself through the appearance of Christ, a parenthetical statement is injected - "for (γάρ) of what did the All have need, if not (εἰ μήτι) of knowledge?" (ⲁⲡⲓ ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ) (p. 19,15-16). The implication is that the universe lacks knowledge and, therefore, does not yet know of its true origin in the Father because of the condition of forgetfulness. This problem of "not-knowing God" which is characteristic of the universe in general is also a problem of man in particular. Although the appearance of Christ is the solution to this problem for the true Gnostics and the potential Gnostics, the non-Gnostics remain ignorant of the Father and are totally unaware of their origin in Him.

p. 30,36 When many had received
the light, they turned
p. 31,1 to Him (= the Father), whereas (those who were)
material (ὕλη) (= the non-Gnostics)
were alien (to Him) (= were not known by Him)
and did not discern His form
3 and did not come to know Him (ⲛⲉⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛϥ)

The non-Gnostics are unaware of their true existence because of forgetfulness and think of themselves only in terms of their physical existence on earth which is "material" (ὕλη) (p. 31,1). In this condition they were unable to discern the form of the Father and "did not come to know Him" (p. 31,3). Therefore, the appearance of the divine messenger has no effect on the non-Gnostics who experience only the lower form of existence which is material.

The influence of the Fourth Gospel can be detected in the presentation of the positive and negative aspects of "knowledge" in the Gospel of Truth. In the Gospel of John Jesus is first concerned that the disciples "should know" (γινώσκωσιν) the Father through him (John 17:3; cf. John 6:69) and then that the world "may know" (γινώσκῃ) Him through the witness of the disciples (John 14:31; 17:23). John also teaches that "the world *did not know* (οὐκ ἔγνω) him" (= Christ) (John 1:10; cf. John 14:17; 17:25) and admits that not all men choose to receive this gift of knowledge (John 3:10; 8:27, 43, and 55; 10:6; 12:16; 13:12 and 28; 14:9; 16:3). The similarity of terminology, however, does not obscure the fact that the thought of the two documents is very different. In the Gospel of John the knowledge of God is inseparably connected with His activity in history which reaches its climax in the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ. It is this personal knowledge of God's work in Christ which provides the understanding on which faith is based. "To know" Christ in this way does not mean to have accurate historical information about his earthly life; it means to direct the whole existence to him in a single movement of trust, obedience, and love. In the Gospel of Truth the emphasis is shifted to man's existential awareness of his true existence in the Father. This "de-historicizing" tendency replaces John's understanding of the earthly ministry of Christ with the Gnostic understanding of the divine origin of man. The result is a complete change of direction from *the knowledge of God* which *comes down* to man by means of the revelation of an earthly Saviour to *the knowledge of man's divine origin* which enables him to *go up* to God by means of the appearance of a heavenly messenger. The fact that this "knowledge" is made available by Christ in both documents points the way to another use of the term in the Gospel of Truth.

b) ⲤⲀⲨⲚⲈ occurs four times with reference to Christ's communication of the knowledge of man's true existence in the Father

(ⲣ̄ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ - p. 16,33; ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ - p. 18,4-5 and 25; p. 20,38). By restricting the work of Christ to the communication of knowledge, the Gospel of Truth emphasizes his illuminating appearance as a divine messenger and ignores his concrete existence with man as an earthly Saviour. This difference is apparent at the beginning of the Gnostic homily in the proclamation of joy which announces that it is possible for man "to come to know (ⲁⲧⲣⲟⲩⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛϥ̄) Him (= the Father) by the power of the Logos" (p. 16,33-34). The Father is the hidden God, "the illimitable, inconceivable One who is superior to all thought" (p. 17,7-8; cf. p. 37,38), but He causes "knowledge" (ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ) (p. 18,4-5) to come into existence in order that He might be known. This is accomplished by sending Jesus into the world as a fruit of "the knowledge of the Father" (ⲡⲓⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲱⲧ) (p. 18,25-26). The result is that those who eat the fruit become joyful because of the discovery of the divine origin of their existence in the Father. The work of Christ as a divine messenger from the Father is, therefore, the solution to the human predicament of forgetfulness.

p. 20,34 When he (= Jesus) had entered
the empty spaces of
terrors (= the material world), he placed
himself at the head
of those who had been stripped by
forgetfulness and thus became both knowledge (ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ)
and perfection. He proclaimed what is in the heart
p. 21,1 [of the Father], in order that the instruction
[might be given]
2 to those who should [receive] instruction.

Because of "forgetfulness" (ⲃϣⲉ) (p. 20,38), man's life had been stripped of its true meaning, but the appearance of Christ communicates to man the knowledge of his origin "in the heart of the Father" (p. 20,39 - p. 21,1). Man's existential awareness of his true existence in God enables him to pass from the state of forgetfulness to the state of "perfection"

(ϫⲱⲕ) (p. 20,39) in which he realizes the limit of his potentialities.

The contrast with the Gospel of John is again quite apparent. Instead of Christ's communication of the knowledge of man's origin in God, John describes Christ's mediation of the knowledge of God to man. His entire earthly ministry is an unveiling of the knowledge of what the Father is like and of what the Father intends man to become. This unveiling is possible because he has intimate knowledge of the Father (John 10:15; 17:25) and of man (John 2:25; 10:14 and 27). Instead of limiting the communication of knowledge to the mere appearance of Christ, John views Christ's mediation of knowledge as the actualization of God's purpose in history which reaches its climax in the crucifixion and the resurrection. This victory over Satan on the cross is the solution to man's separation from God in a life of sin. Whereas the self-knowledge which Christ awakens enables man to be deified in the awareness of his divine origin, the knowledge of God which Christ reveals enables man to be delivered from the bondage of sin and to find the true meaning of life in relation to the Father. The way in which man responds to the revelation of Christ provides the clue to another use of the term "knowledge" in the Gospel of Truth.

c) ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ occurs seven times with reference to man's knowledge of his true existence in the Father, all of which are connected with the present experience of existential awareness (ⲡ̄ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ - p. 19,33; ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ - p. 19,30; p. 25,13; p. 27,21; p. 33,35 and 38; p. 37,37). In the Gospel of Truth the expression "little children" (ⲛ̄ⲕⲉⲕⲟⲩⲓ ϣⲏⲙ) (p. 19,28-29; cf. John 13:33) implies that man receives "knowledge" (ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ) (p. 19,30) only by looking beyond his own wisdom to the true root of his existence in the Father. It is in the act of true self-awareness that man comes to know that the origin of his existence is in the Father. This is expressed in the chiastic formula - "they came to know (that) they were (already) known" (ⲁⲩⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ ⲁⲩⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛⲟⲩ) (p. 19,32-33; cf. John 10:14; 17:25-26). The present experience of existential awareness is only possible because of the past foreordination of the Father which gives the true Gnostics the inner capacity for knowledge. Although "they were (already) known" by God to be creatures of divine origin, this knowledge of their divine origin is inaccessible as long as they remain in the state of forgetfulness which is produced by Error. This is why Christ emanates from the Father as a divine messenger whose appearance makes the Gnostics aware of the true source of their divine origin. It is in this way that "they receive form (μορφή) and knowledge (ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ) from Him"(= the Father) (p. 27,20-31). As a result of this existential awareness of his divine origin, it is possible for the true Gnostic to be reabsorbed into the divine.

p. 33,31 Therefore, do the will of the Father
because you are of Him.
For (γάρ) the Father is kindly (lit. sweet)
and what is of
His will is good.
35 He has knowledge (ⲁϥϫⲓ ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ) of what
is yours, so that you may find your rest
in them. For (γάρ) from the
fruits one has knowledge (ϣⲁⲩϫⲓ ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ) of
39 what is yours.

When man is in reality "of Him" (ϩⲛ̄ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁϥ) (p. 33,32) (= aware of the true origin of his existence in the Father), he is then able "to find rest" (ⲣ̄ⲙⲧⲁⲛ) (p. 33,36) (= to be reabsorbed into the divine). It is also said that "by means of this knowledge (ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ) (of man's true existence) he will purify himself out of a diversity of nature into a unity" (p. 25,12-15). In other words, the wholeness and completeness of man's existence is experienced not in himself but in the awareness of his divine origin in the Father. It is then concluded that "the end is the receiving of knowledge (ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ) about what is hidden, and (ϫⲉ) that is the Father from whom the beginning has come forth (and) to whom all those who have come out from Him will return" (p. 37,37 - p. 38,4). Therefore, it is not enough for man to know the origin of his existence in the Father; this knowledge is only a means toward the end of being reabsorbed into the divine (p. 42,26-30). When the true Gnostic receives the knowledge of his origin in God, he discovers that his true self is also divine. Retrieving in this way "what belongs to him" (p. 21,12-13), he turns toward Him who called him, hears His voice, and ascends to Him (p. 22,4-7). Therefore, the Gospel of Truth teaches that the present experience of existential awareness is at the same time the awakening of the divine essence in man.

In the Gospel of John the possibility of man's receiving the knowledge of the Father is both a present experience and a future hope. During the earthly ministry of Jesus man's understanding is limited to the present knowledge of his life and teaching which is discernable to human perception. This is expressed in the words of Jesus:

> O righteous Father, the world knew Thee not, but I knew Thee; and these knew (ἔγνωσαν) that Thou didst send me (John 17:25; cf. John 10:14; 14:7a).

After the resurrection of Christ, the Holy Spirit will enable the disciples to understand the future promise of Jesus:

> In that day you shall know (γνώσεσθε) that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you (John 14:20; cf. John 7:17; 8:28 and 32; 14:7bc and 17).

Jesus promises that "the Spirit of Truth" (John 14:17) will enable the disciples to know in reality what they presently know only by faith, thereby giving them the assurance of sharing in the ineffable union of Christ and the Father. This future knowledge has as its purpose "that you may know and understand (ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ γινώσκητε) that the Father is in me and I in the Father" (John 10:38). The assurance of being "in Him" is thus the highest point of Christian experience (John 17:21, 23, and 26). It is the Johannine awareness of a relationship of mutual indwelling between God and man which provides a point of departure for the Gnostic teaching of the Gospel of Truth. By detaching this indwelling from the actual death and resurrection of Christ, the Gnostic writer views the present union between God and man in itself as the basis of man's salvation. In the Gospel of John this reciprocal relationship grows out of the present encounter between Christ and his disciples during his earthly ministry but it is only fully understood in the future. Then it will be consummated in the act of the self-giving of Christ on the cross (John 10:11 and 15), and it will be confirmed by the resurrection of Christ from the dead and the coming of the Holy Spirit (John 14:17 and 20). In the Gospel of Truth there is no need for a future consummation or confirmation because knowledge is an inner capacity which man has as a result of his creation by God. The appearance of Christ is all that is necessary to arouse him out of the fog of ignorance which has concealed the knowledge of his true origin in the Father. In the Gospel of John the possibility of receiving knowledge is entirely dependent upon the gift of God in Christ and is inseparably connected with faith (John 8:31-32; 10:38). The earthly ministry of Christ is the means by which God chooses to reveal His knowledge to man, and it is supremely manifested in the crucifixion and the resurrection. The knowledge of what God has done for man in Christ and the acceptance of this redemptive work by faith enables man to enter into a present relationship with God and gives him hope of perfect fellowship with the Father and the Son in the life to come. The part which knowledge plays in helping man to attain this goal points the way to the final use of the term in the Gospel of Truth.

d) ⲤⲀⲨⲚⲈ occurs three times in relation to "Error" (ⲤⲀⲨⲚⲈ - p. 26,24; p. 31,27; p. 32,36) and twice in connection with "ignorance" (ⲤⲀⲨⲚⲈ - p. 30,4-5; p. 31,30). This usage represents the knowledge of man's divine origin as the solution to the predicament of man. It is this knowledge alone which enables the Gnostic to win the victory over the forces of Error and to overcome the deficiency of ignorance. In the Gospel of John the knowledge of God in Christ which is accepted by faith enables man to win the victory over Satan (John 12:31) and to overcome his separation from God which is caused by sin (John 1:29).

It now becomes clear that the place of knowledge in the process of salvation is one of the major differences between the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth. John teaches that the knowledge of God is revealed by Christ and is received by man through faith. The Gnostic writer views the knowledge of man's divine origin as an inner capacity of which he is ignorant until the appearance of Christ brings him to an existential awareness of his true self. Whereas the pivotal center of John's thought is faith which is undergirded by knowledge, the Gospel of Truth rightly deserves the designation "Gnostic" because knowledge alone is the way in which man appropriates eternal life. The contrast between the two documents is also apparent in the relationship of knowledge to love and life.

(a) Knowledge and Love. The understanding of love in the Gospel of Truth is limited to God's love for man which invokes the reciprocal response of man's love for God. This view is expressed in the three occurrences of the Greek noun ἀγάπη (p. 23,30; p. 34,31; p. 43,6) and in the three occurrences of the Coptic verb ⲣ̄ⲘⲀⲒ̈Ⲉ (p. 19,14; p. 26,33; p. 34,3).[109] They are used in three distinct ways. a) ἀγάπη (ⲣ̄ⲘⲀⲒ̈Ⲉ) refers to the Father's love for the *Logos* who emanates from Him for the purpose of bringing man to an awareness of his divine origin (p. 23,30; p. 34,3 and 31). The poetic passage which lists the various attributes of the Father concludes with two important statements: "His *love* (ἀγάπη) is embodied (- σῶμα) in him (= the *Logos*); His *faith* (ⲚⲀϨⲦⲈ) has encompassed him" (p. 23,30-33; cf. p. 20,10), i.e. the "love" which flows from the Father to man takes the form of the heavenly messenger, Jesus Christ, and this embodiment of His love is consistent with His "faithfulness" to man.[110] The same teaching is presented rather abstrusely in the extensive discussion of the fragrance of the Father (p. 33,35 - p. 35,2). It is said that "the Father *loves* (ⲘⲀЇⲈ) His fragrance and makes it manifest in every place" (p. 34,3-5). The meaning of "fragrance" remains hidden until it is disclosed that "God (?) came, abolished the separation, and brought *the warm fulness of love* (ⲠⲒⲠⲖⲎⲢⲰⲘⲀ ⲈⲦϨⲎⲘ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ ϮⲀⲄⲀⲠⲎ)

---

[109] The use of the adjective "beloved" (ⲘⲚ̄ⲢⲒⲦ) (p. 30,31-32) in the phrase "the beloved Son" (ⲠϢⲢ̄ⲘⲚ̄ⲢⲒⲦ) provides the basis for understanding the clumsy Coptic construction ⲈⲦⲞⲨⲀϢϤ̄ ⲠⲈϤϢⲎⲢⲈ (p. 40,24-25). By transposing the word order and emending the verb ⲞⲨⲰϢⲈ (lit. to desire) with the prefix Ϥ, the phrase becomes "His Son whom he desires" (ⲠⲈϤϢⲎⲢⲈ ⲈⲦ[Ϥ]ⲞⲨⲀϢϤ̄), i.e. His beloved Son. The related noun "friend" (ϢⲂⲎⲢ) (p. 39,30) is used in the non-technical sense of "companion" (cf. John 11:11; 19:12). Cf. Walter C. Till, "Das Evangelium Veritatis: Neue Übersetzung des vollständigen Textes," *Z. N. T. W.*, 50 (1958), 183, Anm. 50.

[110] It is remarkable that the only occurrence of the term "faith" (ⲚⲀϨⲦⲈ) (p. 23,32) in the Gospel of Truth appears in connection with the Father's relationship to man and has nothing to do with man's appropriation of salvation. Whereas the term appears as a noun in the sense of "faithfulness" in the Gospel of Truth, the emphasis in the Gospel of John is on the verb "to believe" (πιστεύειν) which appears only with reference to man's relationship to God. The same contrast is apparent in the one occurrence of the adjective "faithful" (πιστός) (John 20:27) in the Gospel of John with reference to man's relationship to God and the one occurrence of the adjective "faithful" (πιστός) (p. 20,10) in the Gospel of Truth with reference to Christ's relationship to man.

(= His fragrance)... in order that the unity of perfect thought might be (realized)" (p. 34,28-34). The fact that "His fragrance" is manifested everywhere and that it brings about the unity of perfect thought makes it clear that the fragrance of the Father is actually a veiled designation for the *Logos*. In other words, the Father loves the *Logos* and allows him to emanate into the world, so that man may become aware of his divine origin and be restored to the unity of perfect thought in God (cf. John 3:16 and 35). Thus, the Father's love for Christ is the way in which he expresses His love for man.

b) ἀγάπη (ⲣ̄ⲙⲁⲓ̈ⲉ) refers to the Father's desire for man to come to an awareness of his divine origin (p. 19,14; p. 43,6). This aspect of the understanding of "love" in the Gospel of Truth is closely related to the understanding of "knowledge."

p. 19,10 Just as a man who has
many offspring (lit. forth through him)
who are ignorant of him
desires to be known and
14 *loved by them* (ϣⲁϥⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ ⲁⲧⲣⲟⲩⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛϥ̄ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲧⲣⲟⲩⲙⲣ̄ⲣⲓⲧϥ), (so the Father
desires) thus (to be known and loved).

The Father desires for all men who are capable of knowledge to realize their true existence in Him, and this includes His desire for them to love Him. In other words, "to know" God is to know the divine origin of the self and to express this self-awareness in love for the true source of one's being. The same idea occurs again when "the true brethren" (= the Gnostics who have found their Resting-Place in the Father) are described as "those upon whom *the love of the Father* (ϯⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲱⲧ) is poured out" (p. 43,6-7; cf. Rom. 5:5). The Father's love for man is, therefore, His desire for man to know the divine origin of his existence.

c) ἀγάπη (ⲣ̄ⲙⲁⲓ̈ⲉ) refers to man's desire to be united with the Father (p. 26,33). Having described the emanation of the *Logos* from the Father as the appearance of the truth (p. 26,28), it is then concluded: "Everyone *loves* (ⲙⲁⲓ̈ⲉ) truth because truth is (the) mouth of the Father" (p. 26,33-35). The implication is that man loves the *Logos* who is the Word which comes from the mouth of the Father. This love for the *Logos* is actually love for the Father who allows him to come forth from His mouth because the *Logos* has "united them (= all heavenly and human creatures who are capable of knowledge) with the Father" (p. 26,32). The use of the expression "to be loved by them" (lit. that they love Him) (ⲁⲧⲣⲟⲩⲙⲣ̄ⲣⲓⲧϥ̄) (p. 19,14) points in the same direction. Thus, the Father's love for man invokes the reciprocal response of man's love for the Father.

The fact that the Father "*desires* (ϣⲁϥ ⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ) ... to be loved by them" (p. 19,12-13) deserves further consideration. The verb "to desire" (ⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ) occurs fourteen times in the Gospel of Truth and is used in three ways. a) ⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ refers to the Father's desire for the *Logos* to come into existence in order to bring man to an awareness of his divine origin (p. 37,18; p. 40,25). b) ⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ refers to the Father's desire for man to come into true existence in Him (p. 19,13; p. 27,26 and 27; p. 18,1, 3, and 25; p. 37,30 and 30-31; p. 43,23-24). c) ⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ refers to man's desire to please the Father by ascending to Him (p. 22,11; p. 33,6). The parallel usages of the terms "love" and "desire" in the Gospel of Truth are more than coincidental. They provide the key to the meaning of ἀγάπη in the Gnostic document. The two ideas merge into one in the climactic closing words of the homily.

> He (= the Father) is good and His children are perfect and are worthy of His name, for (γάρ) He, the Father, *loves* (ⲛⲉⲧϥⲟⲩⲁϣⲟⲩ) children of this sort (p. 43,19-23).

In this passage the verb "to desire" (ⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ) is best translated "to love" (= ἀγαπᾶν) because the meaning of the two verbs is virtually synonymous. The conclusion follows quite naturally that the Gnostic writer is not thinking of ἀγάπη in terms of the self-giving love of God which is revealed in the sacrifice of His Son but as the acquisitive love which finds expression in the "desire" for His children to know Him. C. K. Barrett alludes to this important distinction when he says,

> In the E. V. the Father loves his perfect children in the sense of desiring them; his love is not sacrificial but acquisitive.[111]

The blending of the ideas of "love" and "desire" is also found in the statement that "the Father desires to be known and loved by them" (p. 19,12-13) and in the synonymous usage of "the beloved Son" (p. 30,31-32) and "the Son whom he desires" (p. 40,24-25). The implication is that the Father is strongly desirous of acquiring and possessing that which he has created. Therefore, this desire is expressed in the emanation of the Logos whose mission primarily consists of bringing man to an awareness of his divine origin.

The acknowledgment of the Father's love for man is expressed in terms of man's desire to return to his heavenly origin. This emphasis upon man's vertical ascent to the Father provides the context for the understanding of the ethical teaching of the Gospel of Truth. It is basically a matter of introspection in which the true Gnostic gets his own soul ready for the divine ascent, and it is at the same time a matter of sharing this understanding of his true existence with others who are capable of attaining this knowledge, i.e. the potential Gnostics. The moral duty of the true Gnostic is first to himself and then to the potential Gnostics. Both aspects of the ethical obligation of the true Gnostics are presented in one continuous passage which is given unity by the frequent use of the imperative.

---

[111] C. K. Barrett, "The Theological Vocabulary of the Fourth Gospel and the Gospel of Truth" in Otto A. Piper's Festschrift (1962), p. 216.

p. 32,35 Speak (ϢⲈϪⲈ) concerning the truth to those who
seek it and of knowledge to those
who have committed sins in their error (πλάνη).
p. 33,1 Strengthen (Ⲛ̄ⲦⲰⲦⲚ̄ ⲦⲀϪⲢⲞ) the foot of those
who have stumbled, and stretch out (ⲤⲰⲦ) your
hands to those who are sick. Feed (ⲤⲀⲚϢ)
those who are hungry, and
5 give rest (Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈⲦⲚ̄ ϯ Ⲙ̄ⲦⲀⲚ) to those who are weary.
Lift up (Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈⲦⲚ̄ ⲦⲞⲨⲚⲈⲤ) those who wish
to rise, (and) awaken (Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈⲦⲚ̄ ⲚⲈϨⲤⲈ) those who
are asleep. For (γάρ) you are the
wisdom which is drawn (like a sword for battle). If
10 the strong one acts accordingly, he will become
still stronger. Take heed (ϪⲒ ϨⲢⲎⲦⲚ̄) to yourselves
alone; do not busy yourselves (Ⲙ̄ⲠⲢϪⲒ ϨⲢⲎⲦⲚ̄) with
other (things), that is, those which you have
cast away from yourselves.
15 Do not turn back (Ⲙ̄ⲠⲢ̄ ⲤⲰⲦⲈ) to what you have
vomited forth
in order to eat it. Do not permit yourselves to be
eaten by moths (Ⲙ̄ⲠⲢ̄Ⲣ̄ ϪⲀⲖⲈⲤ);
do not permit yourselves to be eaten by worms (Ⲙ̄ⲠⲢ̄-
Ⲣ̄ϤⲚⲦ), for you have already
shaken it (= this stage of development) off.
Do not become (Ⲙ̄ⲠⲢ̄ ϢⲰⲠⲈ) a dwelling-place (- τόπος)
20 for the Devil (διάβολος), for you
have already destroyed him.
Do not strengthen (Ⲙ̄ⲠⲢ̄ ⲦⲀϪⲢⲞ) your hindrances
which collapse when (ὡς) we abstain from them (?).
For (γάρ) the lawless man is nothing, that he
25 may suffer oppression more than the law.
For (γάρ) that one does
his works because (ὡς)
he is lawless; but this one
does his works among others
30 because (ὡς) he is righteous (δίκαιος).
Therefore, do the will (Ⲛ̄ⲦⲰⲦⲚ ⲘⲠⲞⲨⲰϢ) of your Father
32 because you are of Him.

The emphasis is not on the shorter opening section of seven imperatives which deal with the relationship between the true Gnostics and the potential Gnostics (p. 32,35 - p. 33,11) but on the longer closing section of eight imperatives which deal with the inner life of the true Gnostics (p. 33, 11-32). The climax of the passage relates this entire section to the understanding of "love" in the Gospel of Truth: "Therefore, *do the will of your Father* (Ⲛ̄ⲦⲰⲦⲚ̄ ⲘⲠⲞⲨⲰϢ Ⲙ̄ⲠⲒⲰⲦ) because you are of Him" (p. 33,31-32), i.e. do what your Father desires by acknowledging that your true existence is found in Him. Man's self-awareness of his divine origin is thus the motivation for his sharing this discovery with those who have not yet found it.

> Since he has knowledge, he does the will of the
> One who called him. *He desires* (ϢⲀϤⲞⲨⲰϢⲈ)
> to please Him (and) *finds rest* (p. 22,9-12).

Doing "the will" (ⲠⲞⲨⲰϢⲈ) (p. 22,10) of the Father means that the true Gnostic shares the knowledge of his divine origin with all others who are capable of the same knowledge. This is the way in which man expresses his love to God, i.e. his desire to please Him, and the result is that he finds rest by being absorbed into the divine.

The contrast between the Fourth Gospel and the Gospel of Truth with respect to the understanding of "love" is indeed striking. In the Gospel of John the love of God is freely given to man in the sacrifice of Christ, and man expresses his indebtedness in a life of obedient love to his fellowman. This means that the vertical gift of love from God to man is accepted by faith and expressed horizontally in words and deeds. In the Fourth Gospel the noun ἀγάπη and the verb ἀγαπᾶν are always used of God's love for man or of man's love for man but never of man's love for God. In the Gospel of Truth the love of God is his possessive feeling toward man whom he created and whom he desires to illumine with knowledge by means of the *Logos*, so that man can respond to His love by returning to his divine origin. The result is that the vertical love of God to man is acknowledged in the vertical love of man to God. In fact, this expression of mutual love reaches its climax in man's reabsorption into the divine. The Gnostic use of the terms "love" or "desire" with reference to man's relationship to his fellowman is in sharp contrast to the Fourth Gospel. In the Gospel of Truth man's moral duty to his fellowman is limited to the desire to share the divine origin of his existence with a select group of men who have the same potential in themselves and has nothing to do with the self-giving love of God which demands expression in a life of obedient service to all mankind. Therefore, the ethical dimension of love in the Gospel of John is lost sight of in favor of a metaphysical understanding of love as the Father's desire for man to know the true origin of existence in Him and as man's acknowledgment of this desire by being reabsorbed into the divine.

Upon turning to the attainment of eternal life in the Gospel of Truth the understanding of the Gnostic way of salvation will be brought to a close. Whereas the Gospel of John starts with faith in Christ which enables man to have "eternal life," the Gospel of Truth starts with knowledge of one's true existence which enables man to have what is also referred to as "eternal life." The similarity of terminology is striking, but a closer examination of the thought of the Gospel of Truth will reveal that the Gnostic treatise is actually in a world of its own.

(b) Knowledge and Life. Eternal life in the Gospel of Truth is both a past predilection of the Father and a present possession of man. This true existence in the Father of which man becomes aware by means of the appearance of Christ is referred to five times as "life" (ⲱⲛ̄ϩ) (p. 20,14 and 19; p. 25,19; p. 31,16; p. 43,10), of which two occur as "eternal life" (ⲱⲛ̄ϩ ⲛⲁⲛⲏϩⲉ) (p. 20,30; p. 43,11), and five times as "living" (ⲁⲛϩ = qualitative form of the verb ⲱⲛϩ) (p. 19,35 and 36; p. 21,4 and 5; p. 22,39). As in the Fourth Gospel, the expressions "life" and "eternal life" are used synonymously. Yet it is significant that the Gnostic writer completely ignores the important Johannine connection between faith and life in favor of John's less important emphasis on the connection between knowledge and life (John 17:3). The relationship between knowledge and life in the Gospel of Truth occurs in two main usages. The first usage relates knowledge to "the living Book" (p. 22,38-39) which is identical with Jesus Christ who is "the Word" and with the individual Gnostics who form its "letters" or "characters." The second usage relates knowledge to the assurance which the Gnostic has of overcoming death by attaining "life" (p. 25,12-19). The five occurrences of the verb "living" will be discussed in connection with the former, and the five occurrences of the noun "life" in connection with the latter.

The fact that the true Gnostics have been predestined by the Father to be "the living (ones)" (p. 21,4) is the key to the understanding of "the living Book" (p. 22,39).[112]

p. 22,38 This is namely the knowledge (ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ) of
the living Book (ⲡⲓϫⲱⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲁⲛϩ) which he revealed to the
p. 23,1 world (lit. Aeons) (αἰών) at the end of his [creations],
just as it was revealed [in the beginning],
for there are no letters (τόπος for τύπος) of
voices (= vowels) nor (οὐδέ) characters which
5 lack a voice (= consonants),
so that (ἵνα) one may read them and

---

[112] The term "Book" (ϫⲱⲱⲙⲉ) occurs seven times in the Gospel of Truth as "the Book" (p. 20,9, 12, and 24), "the perfect Book" (p. 23,12-13), "the living Book" (p. 22,39), "the Book of the Living (Ones)" (p. 21,4), and "the living Book of the Living (Ones)" (p. 19,35-36). Instead of reflecting John's use of "book" (βιβλίον) (John 20:30; cf. John 21:35) for the "Gospel" which he had written, the idea of the Book in the Gospel of Truth is developed on the basis of the twenty-three occurrences of the term βιβλίον in the Revelation of John (Rev. 1:11; 5:1-9; 6:14; 10:8; 13:8; 17:8; 20:12; 21:27; 22:7-19). Cf. footnote 114.

think on those things which are vain.
Instead (ἀλλά), they are characters of
truth which one can only pronounce (lit. speak)
10 if he knows them himself. Each
character is a perfect thought
like a perfect Book
which consists of characters.
They have been written by
15 the Unity, since the Father
has written them, in order that (ἵνα) the world
(lit. Aeons) (αἰών)
might come to know the Father
18 by means of His characters.

The use of "knowledge" in this passage points back to the previous affirmation that the Father "revealed it (= His will) (ⲁϥⲟⲩⲁⲛϩϥ̄ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ) (to the world) as knowledge" (p. 22,35-36) in the form of the heavenly messenger, Jesus Christ. The Gnostic writer then proceeds to connect this knowledge with the living Book which likewise "was revealed" (ⲉϥⲟⲩⲁⲛϩ̄ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ) (p. 23,2) by the Father. His revelation does not consist of ordinary "letters of voices (= vowels) nor characters which lack a voice (= consonants)" (p. 23,3-5) but of living "characters of truth" (ϩⲛ̄ⲥϩⲉⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ϯⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲏⲉ) (p. 23,8-9), i.e. the true Gnostics who by means of the appearance of Christ come to know that their true origin is in the Father. These "characters" are true because the persons which they represent become aware of their divine origin in the "perfect thought" (p. 23,11) of the Father. The Father then uses "His characters" (p. 23,18) as the means by which this knowledge is made known in the "world" (lit. Aeons),[113] i.e. among those who are capable of knowledge. This idea is developed in great detail in the section of the ethical teaching referred to above which deals with the relationship between the true Gnostics and the potential Gnostics (p. 32,35 - p. 33,11). Therefore, what the Father reveals is "the living Book" which consists of His living "characters of truth" who become aware of their divine origin in Him and share this knowledge with others who have the same inner capacity.

---

[113] The use of αἰών in the sense of "world" (p. 23,1 and 16) is reminiscent of the New Testament understanding of τοὺς αἰῶνας as "the world" (Heb. 1:2; 11:3). Cf. K. Grobel, op. cit., p. 83.

The revelation of the Book is not made for the world in general but is directed to "their heart" (p. 19,34-35), i.e. to the true Gnostics who have the inner capacity of knowledge.

p. 19,30 When they (= the little children) became strong,
they became acquainted with the forms
of the appearance of the Father. They came to know;
they were known. They were glorified; they
gave glory. In their heart (ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲟⲩϩⲏⲧ) was
revealed
35 the living Book
of the Living (Ones) which stands written
in the thought and in the mind (νοῦς)
p. 20,1 [of the] Father and (which), from before the
foundation (καταβολή)
of the world (lit. All), was in
3 that incomprehensible part of Him (= the Father).

The reference to man's "heart" signifies his inner life which is the seat of the will, the intellect, and the emotion. The heart designates man's innermost being which is endowed with "the seed (σπέρμα) of the Father" (p. 43,14; cf. 1 John 3:9). It is here that the Father has implanted a divine spark at the time of creation which is fanned into a burning flame by the discovery of one's divine origin through introspection. This act of self-awareness is described as "becoming strong" (p. 19,30) or "becoming acquainted with the forms of the appearance of the Father" (p. 19,31-32). The implication is that the true Gnostic simply becomes aware of what the Father had already written in "the living Book of the Living (Ones)" (ⲡⲓϫⲱⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲁⲛϩ̄ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲛⲉⲧⲁⲛϩ̄) (p. 19,35-36).[114] A one-sided doctrine of predestination clearly underlies this expression and is specifically suggested by the fact that the Book "stands written in the thought and in the mind of the Father ... from before the foundation (καταβολή) of the world" (p. 19,36 - p. 20,2; cf. John 17:24; Rev. 13:8; 17:8). Thus, the predestination of the true Gnostics is assured because they have already been registered in "the living Book of the Living (Ones)" as "characters of truth" which exist in the thought and mind of the Father.

---

[114] This is the fullest form which is used to designate the "Book" in the Gospel of Truth. It can be accounted for as a blending of the New Testament imagery from the Gospel of John and the Revelation of John. In (continued next page)

The understanding of predestination in the Gospel of Truth reaches its climax when the true Gnostics recognize that they are themselves "the living (ones)" (p. 21,4) who are inscribed in "the Book of the Living (Ones)."

p. 21,3 And (δέ) those who should receive instruction (are)
the living (ones) (ΝΕΤΑΝϨ) who are inscribed
in the Book
5 of the Living (Ones). They receive instruction
for themselves alone; they are received
by the Father when they return
to Him again. Since (ἐπειδή) the
perfection of the All is in the Father,
10 it is necessary (ἀναγκή) that the All reascend
(lit. go upward)
to Him. Then (τότε), if one
has knowledge, he receives the things
which belong to him (lit. what is his) and puts
them on. For (γάρ) the one who is
15 ignorant has a deficiency, and
it is something important (lit. great) of which
he has need, for (ἐπειδή)
he lacks that which would

(footnote 114 continued) the Fourth Gospel the terms "living" (ζῶν) (John 4:11; 6:51; 7:38) and "of life" (ζωῆς) (John 6:35, 48, and 68; 8:12) are used interchangeably to describe the metaphor for the bringer of salvation and for salvation itself. In the Revelation of John there are two "books" which have influenced the author of the Gospel of Truth: (a) the great Book of Destiny which is called "the (heavenly) scroll" (τὸ βιβλίον) (Rev. 5:1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, and 9) and (b) the divine Register of the Righteous which is called "the Book of Life" (τὸ βιβλίον τῆς ζωῆς) (Rev. 13:8; 17:8; 21:27; cf. Rev. 3:5; 20:15). Cf. Leo Koep, *Das himmlische Buch in Antike und Christentum: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur altchristlichen Bildersprache* (Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1952).

make him perfect. Since (ἐπειδή) the perfection of
the All is in the Father, it is necessary (ἀνάγκη δέ)
20 that the All reascend (lit. go upward)
to Him and that each
one receives the things which belong to him (lit.
what is his).
He (=the Father) registered them beforehand, having
chosen (lit. prepared) them in order to join (lit.
give) (them) to those
25 who had come forth from Him.

The true Gnostics have life because they "are inscribed (ⲤⲎϨ) in the Book of the Living (Ones)" (p. 21,4-5), i.e. because they originated in the thought and mind of the Father. The element of predestination is again emphasized when it is said that the Father "registered them beforehand" (Ⲛ̄ⲦⲀϤⲢ̄ϢⲢⲠ̄ ⲚⲤⲀϨⲞⲨ) (p. 21,23). This metaphor is a combination of the Apostle Paul's emphasis upon God's "foreknowledge" and "predestination" - "those whom He foreknew, He also predestined" (οὓς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισεν) (Rom. 8:29) - and of the emphasis in the Book of Revelation on God's "registering" of those whose deeds win for them eternal blessedness - "those who are written in the Lamb's Book of Life" (οἱ γεγραμμένοι ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ ἀρνίου) (Rev. 21:27; cf. Rev. 17:8; 20:15). The combination of the ideas of "knowing beforehand" and "writing in the Book of Life" leads the Gnostic author to an understanding of predestination in terms of the Father's "registering beforehand" (προεγγράφειν) of those who have been chosen to return to Him. It is striking that the reference to the Book in this passage occurs in the form which is closest to that of the Revelation of John, i.e. "the Book of the Living (Ones)" (ⲠⲒϪⲰⲰⲘⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲈ Ⲛ̄ⲈⲦⲀⲚϨ̄) (p. 21,4-5; cf. Rev. 3:5; 13:8; 17:8; 20:15; 21:27). By adopting the Biblical imagery of the Apostle Paul and the Revelation of John to his own peculiar interest, the Gnostic author shows that he is not satisfied with John's understanding of life as a present possession and a future hope. Instead, he traces the basis for the Gnostics' participation in life back to the thought and mind of the Father where the possibility of life first originated. Thus, eternal life in the Gospel of Truth is also rooted in the past predilection of the Father toward those whom he has chosen.

The relationship between knowledge and life in the Gospel of Truth is not only expressed in the use of the verb "living" but also in the use of the noun "life." The noun ⲱⲛ̅ϩ is used with respect to Christ's higher form of existence in the Father (p. 20,29) and of Christ's awakening of this true existence in man by his death on the cross (p. 20,14; p. 31,16). It also occurs with respect to man's participation in life as a present possession (p. 25,19; p. 43,10).

Whereas the prior fact of predestination is explained in terms of the Father's registering "the living (ones)" in "the living Book," the idea of the Book is also used to explain the mission of Christ as the imparting of life to man.

> For this reason Jesus appeared (and) clothed (lit. veiled) himself with that Book.... Oh, such great teaching when he humbles himself (lit. brings himself down) unto death, (already) being clothed with eternal life (ⲡⲓⲱⲛϩ ⲛⲁⲛⲏϩⲉ) (p. 20,23-24 and 28-30).

If the sacrificial language pertaining to Christ's death on the cross has been correctly interpreted as the symbolical separation of the lower and higher forms of his existence, then the reference to "eternal life" (p. 20, 29-30; cf. John 11:25) is very clear. Christ did not have to undergo the physical agony and suffering of the crucifixion in a literal sense because he was already clothed with eternal life, i.e. because he was already aware of the higher form of his existence in the Father. The implication is that Christ possessed only a spiritual body and was not subject to the weakness of this material world.

The revelatory appearance of Christ, however, is not an end in itself but has meaning for man when it is said that "he took that Book since (ἐπειδή) he knew that his death meant life (ⲟⲩⲱⲛ̄ϩ) for many" (p. 20,13-14; cf. Mark 10:35). Christ is able to take the Book because he is "the Word" which is spoken by the Father. The figurative act of "taking the Book" is his death on the cross which sets him free to participate exclusively in the higher form of his existence in the Father, thereby enabling man to discover the divine origin of his existence in God (cf. Rev. 5:6-7 and 9). This is why "his death meant life for many" (p. 20, 18-19). It is the death of Christ which brings the true Gnostics to the awareness that they are "the living (ones)" who are already registered in "the living Book." The same teaching occurs again in a significant passage which confirms the view that Christ appeared in a spiritual body.

p. 31,4 He (= Jesus) came (only)
in the likeness of flesh (σάρξ), with the result
that no one (or: nothing) could block
his way since it (his flesh)
is incorruptible and incoercible.
Speaking again
10 in new (words) while declaring
what was in the heart of the Father,
he proclaimed the faultless word.
The light spoke through
his mouth,
and his voice
16 produced life (ⲡⲓ ⲱⲛ̄ⲉϩ).

The fact that Jesus came in "the likeness of flesh" (p. 31,5) is not to be confused with the Incarnation of the Fourth Gospel (John 1:14) since his flesh remains "incorruptible and incoercible" (p. 31,8), i.e. he has a spiritual body which is not affected by the weakness of this material world. A clue is given concerning the inspiration behind this teaching when it is said that "no one (or: nothing) could block his way" (p. 31,5-6). In the Fourth Gospel Jesus appeared twice in the midst of the assembled disciples "when the doors were shut" (John 20:19 and 26). It seems that the Gnostic writer accepts the Johannine teaching concerning the spiritual body of Christ (apart from its *raison d'être* in the resurrection) and uses it as a point of departure for the development of his own understanding of the revelatory appearance of Christ as a heavenly messenger who emanates from the Father. Because the spiritual body of Christ is not affected by the weakness of this material world, it is said that "the light spoke through his mouth, and his voice produced life," i.e. he communicated the message of the Father as "the Word" whose appearance enables the true Gnostics to come to know their divine origin as "characters of truth" in "the living Book of the Living (Ones)." The close connection between "light" (p. 31,13) and "life" (p. 31,16) in this passage is reminiscent of Johannine terminology (John 1:4; 8:12), but the thought is entirely different. In the Fourth Gospel life is the true existence which God intends for all men as a result of their believing on Christ; in the Gospel of Truth life is the true existence in the Father of which some men become aware by means of the appearance of Christ. The contrast is between God's gift of life in Christ and man's awareness of his true existence in the Father.

The climax of the understanding of life in the Gospel of Truth is reached when it is viewed as a present possession in the existential awareness of man (p. 25,19; p. 43,10).

> By means of *knowledge* (ⲥⲁⲩⲛⲉ) he (= the true Gnostic) will purify himself out of a diversity of nature into a unity, while he consumes matter (ⲩⲗⲏ) within him like a flame and darkness by light (and overcomes) death by *life* (ⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ) (p. 25,12-19; cf. John 17:3).

The relationship between knowledge and life is clearly stated again (cf.

p. 22,38-39). It is the knowledge of one's divine origin which enables the true Gnostic to overcome "death by life" (ⲠⲘⲞⲨ ϨⲚ̄ ⲞⲨⲰⲚϨ̄) (p. 25,18-19; cf. p. 20,13 and 29; p. 42,20). This assurance is already a present possession in that the act of introspection immediately frees the Gnostic from the lower form of his existence which is entangled with "matter" (ὕλη) (p. 25,16) and thus prepares him for the return to the Father. The influence of the Fourth Gospel is apparent in this connection when John describes the life of the Christian as one which has already passed "from death into life" (ἐκ τοῦ θανατοῦ εἰς τὴν ζωήν) (John 5:24; cf. John 8:51-52; 1 John 3:14). This similarity of language, however, does not obscure the basic difference in thought. In the Gospel of John the reference is to moral death which is caused by sin; in the Gospel of Truth the reference is to an illusory existence which is caused by ignorance. The contrast is carried further in the overcoming of death and the passing into life. In the Gospel of John the transition takes place as a result of faith in Christ; in the Gospel of Truth the change comes about as a result of knowledge of one's divine origin.

The importance of understanding that "eternal life" is the present possession of every true Gnostic is reiterated in the closing section of the Gospel of Truth.

p. 43,3 I (= the author of the Gospel of Truth) will remain
in it (= the Resting-Place) (continually) and
will occupy myself always with the Father of
5 the All and (with) the true brethren,
those upon whom the love (ἀγάπη) of
the Father is poured out and among
whom (lit. in whose midst) nothing of Him (= the
Father) is lacking,
those who really live
10 because they are in the
true and eternal life (ⲠⲒⲰⲚϨ Ⲛ̄ⲚⲀⲚⲎϨⲈ) and
speak about the perfect light
which is filled with
the seed (σπέρμα) of the Father and

15 which is in His heart and in the
Pleroma (πλήρωμα), while
his (= the true Gnostic's) spirit (πνεῦμα) rejoices
in Him (= the Father) and glorifies
Him in whom he was (and still is),
because He (= the Father) is good and
20 His children are perfect and
are worthy of His name,
for (γάρ) He, the Father,
loves children of this sort.

This passage contains a proleptic description of the blessed existence in the Resting-Place of the Father, as if the Gnostic writer already had been reabsorbed into the divine. The assurance of having life in the present experience of self-awareness means that the Gnostics are already "the true brethren" (p. 43,5), i.e. "those who really live because they are in the true and eternal life" (ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲓⲱⲛϩ ⲛⲁⲙⲏⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲛⲏϩⲉ) (p. 43,9-11). The possession of eternal life presupposes the immediate restoration of man to the perfect fellowship in the Father to which he had been predestined at the time of his creation. Because the appearance of Christ awakens the divine spark in man, the true Gnostic becomes aware of the fact that he is filled with the "seed" (σπέρμα) (p. 43,14; cf. 1 John 3:9) of the Father. The same teaching is also expressed in another passage which further describes the true existence of man in the Resting-Place of the Father.

p. 36,35 He (= the Father) is good (ἀγαθός) (and) He knows
His seeds (ⲛ̄ⲛⲓϫⲟ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ̄), for He is
the One (who) has sown (ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥϫⲟ) them in His
paradise (παράδεισος),
and (δέ) His paradise (παράδεισος)
39 is His Resting-Place.

The Father knows His "seeds" (= His children) (p. 36,36) because He has predestined them to have eternal fellowship with Him. This idea of predestination is expressed figuratively as "sowing them (= His seeds) in His paradise" (= His Resting-Place) (p. 36,37) which is "the true and eternal life" (p. 43,9-11). The inspiration for relating the ideas of "sowing" and "eternal life" presumably comes from the Gospel of John.

> He who reaps receives wages and gathers fruit for eternal life (ζωὴν αἰώνιον), so that the one sowing (ὁ σπείρων) and the one reaping may rejoice together. For here the saying holds true, "One sows (ἐστιν ὁ σπείρων) and another reaps" (John 4:36-37; cf. Gal. 6:8).

As the Lord of the harvest, Jesus instructs the disciples concerning their reaping of his spiritual "sowing" in the hearts of men. The reward will be the joy of gathering fruit for "eternal life." The ambiguity of the Johannine teaching concerning "spiritual sowing unto eternal life" provides the point of departure for the development of the Gnostic idea concerning the divine spark within man which results from his predestination by the Father.

Because the appearance of Christ enables man to know the divine origin of his existence in the Father, man is able to return to the Resting-Place of the Father. This self-awareness is also an occasion for rejoicing so that "his (=the true Gnostic's) spirit (πνεῦμα) rejoices in Him (=the Father) and glorifies Him in whom he was (and still is)" (p. 43,17-18). It is significant that the Gospel of Truth begins and ends on the same note of rejoicing. It opens by affirming that "the gospel of (the) truth is joy" (ⲟⲩⲧⲉⲗⲏⲗ) (p. 16,31; cf. p. 38,6), and it closes by reaffirming that the inner self of the true Gnostic "rejoices" (ⲉϥⲧⲉⲗⲏⲗ) (p. 43,16).[115] Strangely enough, this emphasis on joy is found again near the beginning and end of the Fourth Gospel. Having prepared the way for Christ, John the Baptist says, "This joy (χαρά) of mine is now full" (John 3:29). The theme of joy is also prominent in connection with the post-resurrection appearance of Christ where it is said that "the disciples rejoiced (ἐχάρησαν) when they saw the Lord" (John 20:20). The content of joy, however, is very different in the two documents. The Gnostic rejoices because he has discovered the true source of his origin in the Father which is "the true and eternal life" (p. 43, 10-11). The Christian rejoices because of the victory of Christ over death which is confirmed by the resurrection and which gives him the hope of attaining "the resurrection of life" (John 5:24; cf. John 12:25; 14:19).

---

[115] W. E. Crum, A Coptic Dictionary, pp. 308-309 and 410, lists the Greek equivalent of ⲧⲉⲗⲏⲗ as ἀγαλλίασις and the Greek equivalent of ⲣⲉϣⲉ (A^2) as χαρά. Since neither the noun ἀγαλλίασις nor the verb ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι occur in the New Testament, it appears that the Gnostic writer uses ⲧⲉⲗⲏⲗ and ⲣⲉϣⲉ interchangeably for χαρά and χαίρειν. Whereas ⲧⲉⲗⲏⲗ occurs twice as a noun (p. 16,31; p. 38,6) and once as a verb (p. 43,16), ⲣⲉϣⲉ occurs twice as a noun (p. 18,28-29; p. 23,25) and twice as a verb (p. 25,32; p. 32,3). It is remarkable (continued next page)

The discussion of the contrast in the way of salvation as presented by the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth has uncovered the basic differences between the two documents. In spite of many superficial similarities in terminology, there are many significant differences in thought which cannot be overlooked. The one-sided doctrine of predestination which limits salvation to the true Gnostics and the potential Gnostics does violence to John's balance between election and free will. The fact that there is no possibility of salvation for those who are "material" (that is, the non-Gnostics) is a contradiction of John's emphasis on "whosoever believes." This depreciation of matter also keeps the Gnostic author from conceiving of a Christ who has a real body of flesh and blood such as that which is proclaimed by John. For this reason the actual death of Christ is also of no importance since salvation is communicated by his teaching and revelation which are given definitive expression in the symbolical separation

---

(footnote 115 continued) that the Johannine usage is also evenly divided between eight occurrences of the noun χαρά (John 3:29; 15:11; 16:20, 21, 22, and 24; 17:13) and nine occurrences of the verb χαίρειν (John 3:29; 4:36; 8:56; 11:15; 14:28; 16:20 and 22; 19:3; 20:20).

between the lower and higher forms of his existence on the cross, not in the act of physical death itself. The task of the Gnostic Christ is to awaken man's soul to an awareness of its divine origin, not to save men from the bondage of sin. Instead of God's coming down to man in the physical reality of His Son, the Gospel of Truth emphasizes man's ascent to the Father by means of the appearance of the spiritual body of Christ. When these differences are taken seriously, the contrast in the way of salvation becomes very clear. In the Gospel of John salvation is the work of an earthly Saviour who overcomes sin and the Devil by his death and resurrection, thereby giving to man the possibility of eternal life by believing on him. In the Gospel of Truth salvation is the work of a heavenly messenger who overcomes ignorance and Error by his revelation of man's true existence in the Father, thereby giving to man the possibility of reabsorption into the divine by introspection. Whereas the Gnostic homily views salvation in terms of man's existential awareness which is the key to his true existence, the Fourth Gospel views salvation as God's historical activity which is the key to His redemptive purpose.

CHAPTER FOUR

A NEW LOOK AT EARLY CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

The interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Gospel of Truth has brought to light the underlying mentality of the Christian religion and the Gnostic religion. According to John, the Christian religion is man's response of faith to the revelation of God in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. The main purpose of the Fourth Gospel is "*that you might grow in the belief* (πιστεύητε) that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God" (John 20:31). The use of the present subjunctive of πιστεύειν means "to continue to believe, to be confirmed in your faith" in contrast to the aorist subjunctive which means "to believe here and now, to become a Christian" (John 1:17). This response of faith presupposes an understanding of man's existence in terms of history. When the human situation is analyzed in terms of what God has done, is doing, and will do for the redemption of mankind, then faith is viewed from the standpoint of "Holy History" (*Heilsgeschichte*). This means that the history of God's redemptive work in Christ can become actually redemptive for man only if he appropriates it in faith as his personal history. Oscar Cullmann emphasizes the inseparable connection between faith and history in the Christian religion when he says,

> Faith in the New Testament sense is the way by which the past phase of redemptive history becomes effectual for me. In this connection it is, to be sure, necessary for me to believe that this entire process concerns me personally, me as the individual, as sinner and as redeemed in Christ.... Faith in the New Testament sense means to be convinced of the fact that this entire happening

> takes place *for me*, that Christ died on the cross for me, that for me also this central event represents the mid-point. Inasmuch as the history of the people of Israel finds its fulfilment on the cross, it too affects my individual salvation.[116]

The understanding of faith in the Fourth Gospel presupposes that the redemptive work of Christ on the plane of history is the solution to man's sin and guilt. In order for this work of God in Christ to be truly redemptive for man, it must be existentially appropriated by faith. Therefore, the understanding of human existence in the Christian religion is closely related to the understanding of "Holy History."

According to the Gospel of Truth, the Gnostic religion is man's response of self-awareness to the knowledge of his divine origin in the Father which is revealed by the appearance of Christ. The purpose of the Gospel of Truth is for the true Gnostics "to come to know Him (= the Father) by the power of the *Logos*" (p. 16,33-34), i.e. to become aware of the divine essence in them by means of the divine messenger, Jesus Christ. This existential awareness presupposes that the mere appearance of Christ is the solution to man's forgetfulness and ignorance. The absence of any relationship between man's present history and the past redemptive history of God is indeed conspicuous. C. H. Dodd identifies the basic weakness of the Gnostic religion as the divorce of the human situation from redemptive history when he says,

> In the controversy with Gnosticism in the second and third centuries the main point at issue was whether the Christian faith could be detached from its biblical

---

[116] O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1950), p. 219. Cf. Gustav Weth, *Die Heilsgeschichte: Ihr universeller und ihr individueller Sinn in der offenbarungsgeschichtlichen Theologie des 19. Jahrhunderts* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1931), and W. Herberg, "Biblical Faith as *Heilsgeschichte*: The Meaning of Redemptive History in Human Existence," *Chr. Schol.*, 39 (1956), 30.

> and historical basis and presented as a form of Hellenistic theosophy.[117]

This view is confirmed by the Gospel of Truth which is a non-historical, philosophically oriented, anthropological homily whose theme is that of man's absorption into the divine through introspection.

The contrast between the Christian religion and the Gnostic religion which is contained in these two documents presents an important phase of the development of early Christian theology. The implication is that the Gospel of Truth is itself a part of the process of development in the Christian theology of the second century. In this connection the difference between the Christian religion and Christian theology needs to be clarified. It is basically a distinction between the fact of revelation in the Christian religion - "the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints" (Jude 3) - and the reality of development in Christian theology. Although the Christian religion remains basically the same, Christian theology (which is the scientific study and formulation in intellectual terms of the Christian revelation) is continually changing and developing. This fluctuation is due to the fact that the language which men use, the meaning of their words, and the preconceptions which mold their thought change with the changing economic, social, and spiritual environment in which men find themselves. It is quite obvious that theology must take into account these changes or else gradually become unintelligible and irrelevant. Adolf Harnack gives classic expression to the view that Gnosticism must be reckoned with as a part of the development of early Christian theology:

> Historical inquiry ... sees in Gnosticism a series of undertakings, which in a certain way is analogous to the

---

[117] C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953), pp. 136-137.

> Catholic embodiment of Christianity, in doctrine, morals, and worship. The great distinction here consists in the fact that the Gnostic system represents the acute secularising or hellenising of Christianity with the rejection of the Old Testament ... From this point of view the position to be assigned to the Gnostics in the history of dogma, which has hitherto been always misunderstood, is obvious. They were, in short, the Theologians of the first century. They were the first to transform Christianity into a system of doctrines (dogmas). They were the first to work up tradition systematically.[118]

This tendency to philosophically reinterpret the Christian message of salvation in Hellenistic patterns of thought (with the rejection of the Old Testament) is not the sole prerogative of the Gnostics but is also at work in the early Church (with the conservation of the Old Testament). Therefore, it is assumed that the process of change and development in Christian theology is already at work in the early Church during the second century.

As the development of Christian theology encompasses new systems of thought, the early Church begins to test the resulting doctrines by the standard of consistency with the teaching of Scripture (i.e. the Old Testament) and with the continuous tradition of apostolic teaching. In the New Testament the term "tradition" (παράδοσις) (e.g. 1 Cor. 11:2; 2 Thess. 2:15; 3:6) conveys the idea of the transmission of doctrine, irrespective of whether it is handed down orally or in a document. Up to the middle of the second century this tradition means the Church's unwritten traditional teaching since there was as yet no officially sanctioned New Testament canon. Therefore, the so-called Apostolic Fathers (Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, the author of 2 Clement, "Barnabas," and Hermas) and the Greek Apologists (Aristides, Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, and

---

[118] A. Harnack, *A History of Dogma* (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1895), Vol. I, pp. 226-227, a translation of *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 1. Band (3. Aufl.; Freiburg i.B.: J. C. B. Mohr, 1894).

Theophilus) seek to control the development of Christian theology on the basis of consistency with the Scripture (i.e. the Old Testament) and the apostolic tradition. J. N. D. Kelly affirms that "what the apostles saw and proclaimed as eye-witnesses, the prophets testified to beforehand in minutest detail."[119] During the first half of the second century the idea of "tradition" is still in embryonic form since the noun παράδοσις and the cognate verb παραδίδωμι have not yet become the technical term for the authoritative handing down of doctrine or of the doctrine itself which is handed down. It is only in the following half-century that the New Testament is recognized as fully canonical and as entitled to rank alongside the Old Testament. This new development is largely a by-product of the struggle of the early Church with the Gnostic sects and receives its definitive expression in the writings of Irenaeus (fl. A.D. 180-188) and Tertullian (c. A.D. 160-220). As a result of his disputation with the Gnostics, Irenaeus applies the word "tradition" specifically to the Church's oral teaching as distinct from that contained in Scripture (i.e. the Old Testament) and calls it "the canon of the truth" (τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας / *regulam veritatis*) (*Adv. Haer.*, I, 9,4) or "the tradition of the truth" (*veritatis traditionem*) (*Adv. Haer.*, III, 4,1). He also acknowledges that the New Testament is the written formulation of this apostolic tradition. Tertullian extends the idea of "tradition" to include particular practices of the Church, such as baptism and the Lord's Supper, and he identifies it with "the rule of faith" (*regula fidei*) (*De Praescr. Haer.*, 13; cf. *De Virg. Vel.* 1; *Adv. Prax.* 2). This rule is not yet a formal creed but rather the intrinsic shape and pattern of the revelation itself. Since it preserves the apostles' testimony in its original form, Tertullian maintains that the indispensable key to Scripture belongs exclusively to the Church. Therefore, both Irenaeus and Tertullian agree that the one divine revelation is contained in its fulness both in the Bible and in the Church's continuous public witness.

---

[119] J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958), pp. 29-51, esp. p. 34. Cf. F. Büchsel, παραδίδωμι, παράδοσις in G. Kittel's *T. W. N. T.*, 2 (1935), 171-175.

If the Gospel of Truth has been dated correctly in the middle of the second century, then it belongs to the period in which Christian theology is still tested on the basis of consistency with the Scripture (i.e. the Old Testament) and the apostolic tradition. The Gospel of John is a key witness to this apostolic tradition which forms the heart of the Christian religion and is not yet part of an officially sanctioned New Testament canon. The implication is that the understanding of the Christian religion in the Gospel of John can be used as a kind of regulative principle to control the development of Christian theology in the Gospel of Truth. In this way it will be possible to determine the extent to which this Gnostic document correctly interprets or incorrectly misrepresents the Christian religion. The fact that the influence of the Gospel of John is prominent in the Gospel of Truth indicates that the Gnostic religion develops under the influence of the Christian religion. Conversely, the fact that the Gospel of Truth uses the Gospel of John as a point of departure for the presentation of the Gnostic religion indicates that the early Church was faced with the necessity of controlling the development of early Christian theology.

The final chapter will consist of the conclusions, the implications, and the contributions of the present investigation. The conclusions will be given in the course of a comparison of the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth. The similarities between the two documents will illustrate the way in which Gnostic thought develops under the influence of Christianity. The differences will illustrate the need which arises in the early Church for testing the development of early Christian theology on the basis of consistency with the Scripture (i.e. the Old Testament) and the apostolic tradition. The implications will include a comparison of the Gospel of Truth and Valentinianism and a comparison of the Gospel of Truth and Existentialism. On the one hand, the place of the Gospel of Truth in relation to the original statements of Valentinus and the fully developed Valentinian system will further clarify the authorship of the document. On the other hand, the relationship between the existentialism of the Gospel of Truth and Rudolf Bultmann's interpretation of the Fourth Gospel calls for an evaluation of an influential trend in contemporary Biblical theology.

I. A COMPARISON OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN AND THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH

Whereas the two documents have been compared previously on the basis of individual ideas and specific points of interpretation, the final task of comparing the two writings in their entirety will provide the basis for a systematization of the findings. The similarities between the two documents are obvious in the use of a common vocabulary and in the absence of a logical progression of thought. Their differences are very pronounced with respect to the use of the Old Testament and the development of doctrine.

(1) Similarities Between the Two Documents. A comparison of the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth immediately calls to mind two distinctive features of the Fourth Gospel which are reflected in the Gnostic document, i.e. the use of a limited and repetitious vocabulary and the reoccurrence of a few central themes without concern for a logical progression of thought.

(a) The Use of a Common Vocabulary. Having already established the importance of viewing individual words from the standpoint of larger ideas, a comparison of the vocabulary of the two documents must go beyond a mere alphabetical listing of terms which they share in common. Instead, the individual words will be brought together in groupings according to the ideas which they represent. This inventory will be made by giving an English translation of each term along with the respective Greek and Coptic forms and the number of occurrences in both documents.[120]

a) Nine groupings consist of the leading ideas of the Gospel of John which are accepted and reinterpreted in the Gospel of Truth. The basis for selecting these terms is not purely statistical. Although all of them occur eight or more times both in the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth, the important things is that they are all essential to the understanding of the way of salvation in the two documents. The order of the terms is based on the number of occurrences in the Gospel of Truth, beginning with the highest and continuing to the lowest.

	Gospel of John		Gospel of Truth	
Father (divine)	115	πατήρ	88	ⲒⲰⲦ
father (human)	22	πατήρ	-	
name (divine)	13	ὄνομα	42	ⲢⲈⲚ
name (appellation)	12	ὄνομα	2	ⲢⲈⲚ

---

[120] The frequency with which terms occur in the Gospel of John is based on the Moulton-Geden *Concordance*. Cf. R. Morgenthaler, *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes* (Zürich: Gotthelf Verlag, 1958). The frequency with which terms occur in the Gospel of Truth is based on the Indices of M. Malinine, *Evangelium Veritatis* and *Evangelium Veritatis* (*Supplementum*). Cf. Walter C. Till, "Die Kairener Seiten des 'Evangeliums der Wahrheit'," *Or.*, 28 (1959), 170-185.

	Gospel of John		Gospel of Truth	
knowledge	-		22	ⲤⲀⲨⲚⲈ/Ⲙ̄ⲘⲈ
know	141	γινώσκω οἶδα	18	Ⲣ̄ⲤⲀⲨⲚⲈ Ⲣ̄ⲘⲘⲈ
Son (divine)	17	υἱός	11	ϢⲎⲢⲈ
only Son	3	μονογενὴς υἱός	-	
only	1	μονογενής	-	
son (human)	33	υἱός	-	
children	5	υἱοί/τέκνα	6	ϨⲚ̄ ϢⲎⲢⲈ
light	20	φῶς	14	ⲞⲨⲀⲈⲒⲚ
enlighten	1	φωτίζω	3	Ⲣ̄ⲞⲨⲀⲈⲒⲚ
truth	25	ἀλήθεια	16	ⲘⲎⲈ
Word (revealed)	4	λόγος	6	ϢⲈϪⲈ/ⲖⲞⲄⲞⲤ
word (spoken)	30	λόγος	5	ϢⲈϪⲈ/ⲖⲞⲄⲞⲤ
words (spoken)	4	λόγοι	2	ϨⲚ̄ ϢⲈϪⲈ
word (Scripture)	2	λόγος	-	
life	19	ζωή	3	ⲰⲚϨ̄
eternal life	17	ζωὴ αἰώνιος	2	ⲰⲚϨ̄ Ⲛ̄ⲀⲚⲎϨⲈ
live	17	ζάω	5	Ⲣ̄ⲰⲚϨ
Spirit	9	πνεῦμα	2	ⲠⲚ̄Ⲁ
Holy Spirit	3	πνεῦμα ἅγιον	3	ⲠⲚ̄Ⲁ ⲈⲦⲞⲨⲀⲀⲂ
Paraclete	4	παράκλητος	-	

	Gospel of John	Gospel of Truth
spirit (human)	11 πνεῦμα	3 ⲡⲛ̅ⲁ̅
wind	1 πνεῦμα	-

By way of summary the total number of occurrences of these nine groupings will be listed in parallel columns from the highest to the lowest in both documents. In this way the prominence of the various ideas can be compared at a glance.

Gospel of John		Gospel of Truth	
knowledge	141	Father	88
Father	137	name	44
Son	59	knowledge	40
life	53	Son	17
Logos	40	light	17
Spirit	28	truth	16
name	25	*Logos*	13
truth	25	life	10
light	24	Spirit	8

This common core of theological vocabulary clearly demonstrates the affinity of the Gospel of Truth to Johannine thought. In each of these nine instances the influence of the Gospel of John is strongly reflected in the Gospel of Truth and provides the Biblical foundation for the development of this phase of Gnostic thought.

b) Twenty-four groupings consist of the subsidiary aspects of the Gospel of John which are accepted and reinterpreted in the Gospel of Truth.

All of these terms (except "place," "work," and "call") occur less than eight times in either the Gospel of John or the Gospel of Truth. Again the arrangement of the order of the terms is based on the number of occurrences in the Gospel of Truth, beginning with the highest and continuing to the lowest.

	Gospel of John		Gospel of Truth	
completion	-		2	ϫⲱⲕ
complete	4	τελειόω	2	ⲣ̄ϫⲱⲕ
perfection	-		7	ϫⲱⲕ
make perfect	1	τελειόω	19	ⲣ̄ϫⲱⲕ
finish	2	τελέω	-	
desire (noun)	11	θέλημα	14	ⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ
desire (verb)	23	θέλω	14	ⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ
place (earthly)	15	τόπος	3	ⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ/ⲙⲁ
place (heavenly)	2	τόπος	12	ⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ/ⲙⲁ
Dwelling-Place (heavenly)	-		4	ⲧⲁⲉⲓⲉ ⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲙⲧⲁⲛ
dwelling-places (heavenly)	1	μοναί	-	
dwelling-places (human)	-		6	ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ ϩⲛ̄ ⲙⲁ
all things	1	πάντα	1	ⲛⲕⲉⲉⲓ ⲛⲓⲙ
the All	-		20	ⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ̄

	Gospel of John		Gospel of Truth	
fulness	1	πλήρωμα	4	ⲡⲗⲏⲣⲱⲙⲁ
fill	15	πληρόω	9	ⲣ̄ⲙⲟⲩϩ
the Pleroma	-		6	ⲡⲓⲡⲗⲏⲣⲱⲙⲁ
"pleromas"	-		1	ϩⲛ̄ⲡⲗⲏⲣⲱⲙⲁ
work (thing)	6	ἔργον	9	ϩⲱⲃ/ϩⲱϥ
works	21	ἔργα	5	ϩⲛ̄ϩⲃⲏⲩⲉ ϩⲛ̄ⲉⲣⲅⲟⲛ
work (verb)	8	ἐργάζομαι	3	ⲣ̄ϩⲱⲃ
call (verb)	13	φωνέω	7	ⲣ̄ⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ
voice	15	φωνή	7	ⲥⲙⲏ/ϩⲣⲁⲩ
choose	5	ἐκλέγομαι	2	ⲣ̄ⲥⲱⲧⲡ
way (Jesus)	1	ὁδός	3	ⲙⲁⲉⲓⲧ
guide (Jesus)	-		1	ϫⲁⲩⲙⲁⲉⲓⲧ
way (access)	4	ὁδός	-	
ways (access)	-		1	ϩⲛ̄ⲙⲁⲉⲓⲧ
space	-		1	ⲙⲁⲉⲓⲧ
spaces	-		6	ϩⲛ̄ⲙⲁⲉⲓⲧ
place	-		1	ⲙⲁⲉⲓⲧ
places	-		1	ϩⲛ̄ⲙⲁⲉⲓⲧ
salvation	1	σωτηρία	5	ⲟⲩϫⲉⲉⲓ/ⲥⲱⲧⲉ
Saviour	1	σωτήρ	1	ⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ
save	6	σώζω	1	ⲣ̄ⲧⲛϩⲟ

	Gospel of John		Gospel of Truth	
glory	18	δόξα	3	ⲉⲁⲩ
glorify	23	δοξάζω	4	ⲣ̄ϯ ⲉⲁⲩ
teacher	8	διδάσκαλος	1	ⲥⲁϩ
teaching	3	διδαχή	3	ⲥⲃⲱ/ⲥⲉⲃⲱ
teach	10	διδάσκω	3	ⲣ̄ⲧⲁⲙⲟ ⲣ̄ⲧⲥⲉⲃⲱ
joy	8	χαρά	4	ⲧⲉⲗⲏⲗ/ⲣⲉϣⲉ
rejoice	9	χαίρω	3	ⲣ̄ⲧⲉⲗⲏⲗ ⲣ̄ⲣⲉϣⲉ
love (noun)	7	ἀγάπη	3	ⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ
love (verb)	49	ἀγαπάω φιλέω	3	ⲣ̄ⲙⲁïⲉ
grace	4	χάρις	6	ϩⲙⲁⲧ/ⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥ
fruit	10	καρπός	5	ⲟⲩⲧⲁϩ/ⲕⲁⲣⲡⲟⲥ
death	8	θανατός	4	ⲙⲟⲩ
kill	-		1	ⲣ̄ⲙⲟⲩⲟⲩⲧ
perish	10	ἀπόλλυμι	2	ⲣ̄ⲧⲉⲕⲟ
annihilation	-		1	ⲧⲉⲕⲟ
cross	4	σταυρός	3	ⲥ⳨ⲟⲥ/ϣⲉ
above	5	ἄνωθεν	3	ⲡⲥⲁⲛϩⲣⲉ

	Gospel of John		Gospel of Truth	
exalt	5	ὑψάω	2	ⲣ̄ϫⲓⲥⲉ
heights	-		1	ϩⲛ̄ϫⲓⲥⲉ
darkness	10	σκοτία σκοτός	3	ⲕⲉⲕⲉⲓ
night	6	νύξ	3	ⲟⲩϣⲏ
day	31	ἡμέρα	2	ϩⲱⲟⲩ
hate (verb)	12	μισέω	1	ⲣ̄ⲙⲁⲥⲧⲉ

It will be helpful to list the twenty-four groupings in parallel columns from the highest to the lowest number in both documents. These terms also provide an excellent opportunity to discuss the hermeneutical method of the Gnostic writer.

Gospel of John		Gospel of Truth	
love	56	completion	30
glory	41	desire	28
work	35	place	25
desire	34	the All	21
call	33	the Pleroma	20
day	31	work	17
teacher	21	call	16
place	18	way	14
joy	17	salvation	7

Gospel of John		Gospel of Truth	
fulness	16	glory	7
hate	12	teacher	7
fruit	10	joy	7
perish	10	love	6
darkness	10	grace	6
salvation	8	fruit	5
death	8	death	4
complete	7	perish	3
night	6	cross	3
way	5	above	3
exalt	5	exalt	3
above	5	darkness	3
grace	4	night	3
cross	4	day	2
all things	1	hate	1

The acceptance and reinterpretation of Johannine ideas in the Gospel of Truth is most apparent in words that have a twofold usage or a double meaning. Both of these factors have a bearing upon the understanding of "completion" in the Gospel of Truth. John uses the verb "to complete" in the twofold sense of "bringing to an end, bringing to a goal" (John 4:34; 5:36; 17:4; 19:28) and of "making perfect" (John 17:23; cf. 1 John 4:18). In the former usage the double meaning of the term is both chronological and theological (i.e. teleological). The Gospel of Truth accepts this twofold usage but shifts the emphasis from "completion" (p. 25,28; p. 25,3, 9, and 35) to "perfection" (p. 18,14, 33, and 36; p. 19,4 and 7; p. 20,39;

p. 21,9 and 18; p. 23,11 and 23; p. 26,31; p. 27,15 and 24; p. 32,30 and 32; p. 34,34; p. 36,20 and 25; p. 37,1; p. 39,2; p. 40,19; p. 42,16 and 28; p. 43,13 and 19). In contrast to the double meaning of the term "complete" in the Gospel of John, the Gospel of Truth preserves only the chronological sense of the term and avoids the teleological perspective which is basic to Johannine thought. The Gospel of Truth also reflects only one aspect of the double meaning which is contained in the Johannine adverb "above" (John 3:3 and 7), i.e. "to be from above" (= of God), not "to be born again" (= a second time). The same tendency is seen in the use of the verb "to lift up or exalt" (John 3:14; 8:28; 12:32 and 34; p. 23,27). According to John, the term has the double meaning of the physical death of Christ on the cross and the spiritual ascension of Christ into heaven. The Gnostic writer, however, is only interested in Christ's return to the higher world of the Father. The twofold Johannine usage of "place" in an earthly (e.g. John 4:20; 5:13) and an heavenly sense (John 14:2-3) is reflected in the Gospel of Truth but the emphasis is shifted from the earthly (p. 25, 26 and 29; p. 35,30) to the heavenly sphere (p. 34,15; p. 36,39; p. 40, 32-33; p. 41,4, 5-6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 23, and 25; p. 42,37, 38-39, and 40; p. 43,1). The same tendency occurs again in the twofold usage of the term "way" with reference to the historical person of Christ (John 14:6; p. 18,19 and 20; p. 31,29; cf. p. 19,17) and to man's access to the Father through Christ (John 14:4-5; p. 20,21-22; cf. John 1:23). The Gnostic writer, however, uses the Johannine teaching only as a point of departure for the development of his own distinctive cosmology in terms of "spaces" (p. 20,25; p. 25,10; p. 26,15; p. 27,10-11; p. 28,11; p. 42,8-9; cf. p. 27,25) and "places" (p. 22,22; cf. p. 22,26). These Johannine terms with twofold usages or double meanings clearly illustrate the way in which the Gnostic writer uses the Gospel of John. The implication is that the author of the Gospel of Truth only uses the aspects of Johannine thought which are compatible with his own Gnostic views. Therefore, his hermeneutical method is based on a highly selective principle which accepts the teaching of the Gospel of John only in a fragmentary way.

The acceptance and reinterpretation of Johannine thought in the Gospel of Truth also reveals that the underlying presupposition of the Gnostic writer is existentialism. The vocabulary of the Gospel of John is used only as a means of helping man to attain a true understanding of himself. The Johannine understanding of Jesus as a "teacher" who communicates the truth of the Father in word and deed as a representative of the nation Israel (e.g. John 1:38; 20:16) is reinterpreted in the Gospel of Truth as the communication of the truth of the Father which awakens the divine origin of man's existence in God (p. 18,21; p. 19,20; p. 20,28; p. 21,2; p. 23,20; p. 30,33). The use of the term "cross" in the Gospel of John for the instrument of Jesus' physical suffering and death (John 19:17, 19, 25, and 31) is reinterpreted in the Gospel of Truth as the means of separation between the lower and higher form of his existence (p. 18,24; p. 20,25 and 27). The Johannine use of the term "fruit" as an expression for the productiveness of the Christian life (e.g. John 15:2, 4, 5, 8, and 16) is reinterpreted from an existential standpoint in the Gospel of Truth as "the knowledge of one's existence in the Father" (p. 18,25; p. 23,35; p. 28,7 and 17-18; p. 33,38). The presupposition of existentialism is also applied to the Johannine dualism between life and death and between light and darkness. In the Gospel of John the former sinful existence of man in rebellion against God is characterized as eternal "death" (John 5:24; 8:51-52), and the new existence of man in union with God through faith in Christ is referred to as eternal "life" (e.g. John 5:24; cf. 1 John 3:14). In the Gospel of Truth the former ignorant existence of man in a state of forgetfulness is characterized as "death" (p. 20,13 and 29; p. 25,18-19; p. 42,20), and the existential awareness of man's divine origin in the Father is referred to as "life" (p. 25,19; p. 43,10). In the Gospel of John man's existence in sin is closely identified with the world which is the realm of "darkness" (John 1:5a), but the darkness can be overcome because of the manifestation of "light" in the historical person of Jesus Christ (John 1:9; 3:19; 12:46). In the Gospel of Truth man's existence in ignorance is described as "darkness" (p. 18,17; p. 24,37; p. 25,17-18), and the darkness is overcome by the "illumination" of Christ as a heavenly messenger (p. 31,14; p. 34,7; p. 35,28). The same contrast is further described in the Gnostic homily in terms of "night" (p. 28,28; p. 30,4; p. 32,28; cf. John 11:10) and "day" (p. 32,27 and 32; cf. John 6:39, 40, 44, and 54). The conclusion is self-evident that the Gnostic writer ignores the historical life and death of Jesus in favor of the existential "death" (= overcoming of the ignorance) and "life" (= knowledge of the divine origin) of man. Therefore, the author's hermeneutical method is based on a highly specialized presupposition which causes him to interpret the Fourth Gospel from the standpoint of existentialism. The fact that the Gnostic writer interprets the Gospel of John by means of a principle of selection and a presupposition of existentialism is confirmed by the absence of many essential ingredients of Johannine thought in the Gnostic treatise.

c) Eight groupings consist of important aspects of Johannine thought which are overlooked in the Gospel of Truth. The contrast between the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth at this point gives the impression that the two documents are in entirely different realms of thought. Since there is very little divergence in the frequency with which these terms occur in the Gospel of Truth, they will be listed according to the number of occurrences in the Fourth Gospel, beginning with the highest and continuing to the lowest.

	Gospel of John		Gospel of Truth	
faith	-		1	ⲚⲀϨⲦⲈ
believe	98	πιστεύω	-	
faithful	1	πιστός	1	ⲠⲒⲤⲦⲞⲤ
world	78	κόσμος	1	ⲔⲞⲤⲘⲞⲤ
send	60	ἀποστέλλω πέμπω	1	ϪⲀⲨ
judgment	11	κρίσις	1	ⲔⲢⲒⲤⲒⲤ
judge	19	κρίνω	-	
sin (noun)	14	ἁμαρτία	-	
sins	4	ἁμαρτίαι	-	
sin (verb)	4	ἁμαρτάνω	2	Ⲣ̄ⲚⲀⲂⲒ
sinner	4	ἁμαρτωλός	-	
sign	5	σημεῖον	1	ⲘⲀⲈⲒⲚⲈ
signs	12	σημεῖα	-	
wonder	-		1	ⲘⲀⲈⲒϨⲈ
wonders	1	τέρατα	-	

	Gospel of John	Gospel of Truth
flesh	13 σάρξ	1 ⲥⲁⲣⲝ
body	6 σῶμα	2 ⲥⲱⲙⲁ

These eight groupings cover the entire scope of the way of salvation in the Fourth Gospel. The predicament of man in rebellion against God is expressed by the principle and practice of "sin" (e.g. John 1:29; 8:24; cf. p. 32,37; p. 35,26). The redemptive work of Christ includes his mission, his ministry, and his passion. The mission of Christ consists of the fact that he is "sent" (e.g. John 3:17 and 24; cf. p. 41,24) by the Father into the "world" (e.g. John 3:16-17; cf. p. 24,23) in order to bring "judgment" (e.g. John 3:19; cf. p. 25,26) upon man. The ministry of Christ consists of historical acts called "signs" (e.g. John 2:11; 6:2; cf. p. 22,28; p. 32,16) which point beyond themselves to the purpose of God. The passion of Christ consists of his suffering and death in human "flesh" (e.g. John 1:14; 6:51; cf. p. 31,5-6) and with a physical "body" (e.g. John 19:31; 20:12; cf. p. 23,31; p. 26,8). The attainment of eternal life consists of man's acceptance of Christ by "faith" (e.g. John 3:16; 3:36; cf. p. 20,10; p. 23,32). Since these aspects of the Johannine way of salvation are not compatible with the Gnostic *presupposition of existentialism*, they are largely ignored in the Gospel of Truth. The use of the mere words, however, implies that the Gnostic writer was acquainted with the full scope of salvation in the Fourth Gospel but that he made use of a *principle of selection* in determining what to emphasize and what to overlook. By intentionally ignoring these essential aspects of Johannine thought, the author of the Gospel of Truth leaves himself free to develop his distinctive Gnostic doctrines.

d) Fourteen groupings consist of subsidiary aspects of the Gospel of John which are rejected by the author of the Gospel of Truth and replaced with his own distinctive Gnostic ideas. The Gnostic writer is not satisfied with the ordinary meaning of some Johannine words; therefore, he proceeds to transform them into his own system of thought. These words will be listed in the order of their frequency in the Gospel of Truth, beginning with the highest and continuing to the lowest.

	Gospel of John		Gospel of Truth	
deficiency	-		10	ϣⲧⲁ
be deficient	1	ὑστερέω	5	ⲣ̄ϣⲧⲁ
turn	5	στρέφω ἐπιστρέφω	5	ⲣ̄ⲛⲟⲩϩⲉ
overturn	1	ἀναστρέφω	-	
return (noun)	-		3	ⲥⲧⲟ/ⲧⲁⲧⲥⲟ
return (verb)	-		6	ⲣ̄ⲥⲧⲟ
book (document)	2	βιβλίον	-	
the Book (heavenly)	-		7	ⲡⲓϫⲱⲱⲙⲉ
fragrance	1	ὀσμή	7	ⲥⲧⲁⲉⲓ
disturbance	1	ταραχή	3	ϣⲧⲁⲣⲧⲣ̄
be disturbed	7	ταράσσω	3	ⲣ̄ϣⲧⲁⲣⲧⲣ̄

	Gospel of John		Gospel of Truth	
rise	15	ἐγείρω διεγείρω	3	Ⲣ̄ⲦⲰⲰⲚ/ Ⲣ̄ⲦⲠⲈ Ⲣ̄ⲦⲞⲨⲚⲈⲤ
awaken	-		4	Ⲣ̄ⲚⲈϨⲤⲈ
for ever	13	εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα	-	
the Aeons	-		6	ⲚⲒⲀⲒⲰⲚ
fear	3	φόβος	5	ϨⲢ̄ⲦⲈ
sleep (noun)	-		3	Ⲛ̄ⲔⲀⲦⲔⲈ
sleep (verb)	2	κοιμάομαι	2	Ⲣ̄Ⲛ̄ⲔⲀⲦⲔⲈ
jar (literal)	1	σκεῦος	-	
jars (figurative)	-		4	ϨⲚ̄ⲤⲔⲈⲨⲞⲤ
seed	-		1	ⲤⲠⲈⲢⲘⲀ
seeds	-		1	ϨⲚ̄ϪⲞ
sow	2	σπείρω	1	Ⲣ̄ϪⲞ
sabbath (earthly)	13	σάββατον	-	
the Sabbath (heavenly)	-		2	ⲠⲤⲀⲂⲂⲀⲦⲞⲚ
drunkenness	-		1	ϮϨⲈ
be drunk	1	μεθύω	1	Ⲣ̄ϮϨⲈ
mother	11	μήτηρ	1	ⲘⲈⲈⲨ

The development of Gnostic technical terminology has already been hinted at in the previous list of subsidiary aspects of the Fourth Gospel. Even though the Gnostic author accepts the Johannine use of "all things" (John 1:3; p. 38,13) and "fulness" (John 1:16; p. 34,20 and 36; p. 35,8 and 29), he adds his own Gnostic emphasis in the idea of "the All" (p. 17,5 and 6-7; p. 18,34, 35, and 38; p. 25,22; p. 43,5) and "the Pleroma" (p. 16, 35; p. 35,35-36; p. 36,10; p. 41,1 and 14; p. 43,15-16). The same tendency is also at work, apart from a close affinity with Johannine thought, in the development of the ideas of "the Book" (p. 19,35-36; p. 20,9, 12, and 24; p. 21,4; p. 22,39; p. 23,12-13), "the Aeons" (p. 19,1; p. 23,1 and 16; p. 24,17; p. 27,7; p. 38,35-36), and "the Sabbath" (p. 32,18 and 23-24). This means that the Gnostic author rejects the ordinary use of the terms "book" (John 20:30; 21:25), "for ever" (John 6:51 and 58; 8:35; 12:34; 14:16), and "sabbath" (John 5:9, 10, 16, and 18; 7:22 and 23; 9:14 and 16; 19:31) and shifts the emphasis from the earthly to the heavenly realm. Moreover, the ordinary use of the verbs "turn" (John 1:38; 20:14 and 16; 21:20) and "sow" (John 4:36-37) are rejected in favor of the Gnostic idea of the implanting of the divine "seed" (p. 36,36 and 37; p. 43,14) in man which enables him to "return" (p. 19,5; p. 21,7; p. 22,20; p. 24,6; p. 30, 13; p. 35,21-22; p. 36,15; p. 41,7) to the Father. In contrast to John's literal use of the verb "rise"(e.g. John 5:8; 13:4), the verbs "rise" (p. 33,6 and 7; p. 42,2) and "awaken" (p. 29,26; p. 30,12 and 14; p. 33,7) are used in the Gospel of Truth to express the Gnostic idea of man's existential awareness of his divine origin. The Johannine use of the nouns "jar" (John 19:29) and "fragrance" (John 12:3) in a literal sense is given a figurative interpretation in the allegory of the "jars" (p. 25,28 and 33; p. 26,10; p. 36,21) and the allegory of the "fragrance" (p. 34,1, 4, 6, 10, 14, 17, and 26). The ordinary use of the term "mother" (John 1:17 and 45; 3:14; 5:45 and 46; 6:32; 7:19, 22, and 23; 8:5; 9:28 and 29) is rejected in favor of the title "Mother" (p. 24,7) as a designation for the Holy Spirit. The literal meaning of the remaining terms in this category is passed over in favor of a figurative meaning with respect to a description of man's ignorant condition prior to the appearance of Christ, i.e. "deficiency" (p. 24,21, 26, 29, and 32; p. 25,2; p. 32,12; p. 35,9, 12, 28, 33, and 36; p. 36,25 and 31; p. 42,31; cf. John 2:3), "disturbance" (p. 26,9 and 16; p. 29,2-3, 11, and 30; p. 36,16; cf. John 5:4 ; 5:7; 11:13; 12:27; 13:21; 14:1 and 27), "fear" (p. 17,10-11 and 33; p. 20,36; p. 28, 29; p. 29,2; cf. John 7:13; 19:38; 20:19), "sleep" (p. 29,9, 10, and 35-36; p. 30,7; p. 33,78; cf. John 11:11 and 12), and "drunkenness" (p. 22, 17 and 18; cf. John 2:10). The implication is that the Gnostic writer is using an allegorical method of interpretation to promulgate his Gnostic ideas. There are two extended passages which illustrate this method, i.e. the allegory of the jars (p. 25,25 - p. 26,15; p. 36,13-34) and the allegory of the fragrance (p. 33,35 - p. 35,2). There is also an abundance of figurative language which is closely related to the method of allegory. Therefore, the hermeneutics of the author of the Gospel of Truth consists of a principle of selection, a presupposition of existentialism, and an allegorical method of interpretation.

e) Fifty-five groupings represent the additional vocabulary of the Gospel of John which occurs in the Gospel of Truth. Seven groupings give the persons of the drama, eleven the parts of the body, and thirty-seven the miscellaneous vocabulary of the two documents. Each of these three groups will be presented on the basis of the number of occurrences in the Gospel of Truth, beginning with the highest and continuing to the lowest.

Dramatis Personae	Gospel of John		Gospel of Truth	
Lord (master)	54	κύριος	4	ϫⲁⲉⲓⲥ / ⲚⲈⲠ
rule (be lord)	-		1	ⲣ̄ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ϫⲁⲉⲓⲥ
Jesus	234	Ἰησοῦς	2	ⲓⲏ̅ⲥ̅
Christ	19	χριστός	1	ⲡⲭ̅ⲥ̅
Jesus Christ	3	Ἰησοῦς χριστός	1	ⲓⲏ̅ⲥ̅ ⲡⲉⲭ̅ⲣ̅ⲥ̅
Shepherd	6	ποιμήν	1	ϣⲱⲥ
sheep	17	πρόβατον	3	ⲉⲥⲁⲩ
man	60	ἄνθρωπος	4	ⲣⲱⲙⲉ
God	83	θεός	2	ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ
Devil	3	διάβολος	1	ⲇⲓⲁⲃⲟⲗⲟⲥ
brother	8	ἀδελφός	-	
brethren	6	ἀδελφοί	1	ⲥⲛⲏⲩ

Corporis Membra	Gospel of John		Gospel of Truth	
heart	7	καρδία	7	ϩⲏⲧ
mouth	1	στόμα	3	ⲣⲱ

mind	-		3	ΝΟΥϹ
understand (verb)	1	νοέω	1	Ρ̄ΝΟΕΙ
understanding	-		1	ΜΝ̄ΤΡΜ̄Ν̄ϨΗΤ
soul (life)	10	ψυχή	1	ΨΥΧΗ
psychic	-		1	ΨΥΧΙΚΟΝ
bosom	2	κόλπος	2	ΤΑΠ
foot	-		1	ΟΥΡΙΤΕ
feet	14	πόδος	1	ϨΝ̄ΟΥΕΡΙΤΕ
head	5	κεφαλή	2	ΑΠΕ
hand	5	χείρ	2	ϬΙϪ
hands	10	χεῖρα	-	
ear	1	ὠτίον	2	ΜΕϢϪΕ
eyes	18	ὀφθαλμοί	1	Β̄Λ̄Λ̄ΕΕΥ
blood	6	αἷμα	1	ϹΝΑϤ

Miscellaneous Vocabulary	Gospel of John		Gospel of Truth	
reveal (appear)	9	φανερόω	32	Ρ̄ΟΥΩΝϨ̄/Ρ̄ϬΩΛΠ
revelation	-		4	ΟΥΩΝϨ/ϬΩΛΠ

	Gospel of John		Gospel of Truth	
make (do)	110	ποιέω	27	ⲣ̄ⲧⲣⲟ/ⲣ̄ⲧⲉⲛⲟ
think	1	λογίζομαι	9	ⲣ̄ⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ
thought	-		12	ⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ
reflection	-		1	ⲙⲁⲕⲙⲉⲕ
receive	46	λαμβάνω	20	ⲣ̄ϫⲓ
find (verb)	19	εὑρίσκω	6	ⲣ̄ϭⲓⲛⲉ
discovery	-		5	ϭⲓⲛⲉ
give	76	δίδωμι	10	ⲣϯ
see	53	ὁράω βλέπω	9	ⲣ̄ⲛⲉⲩ
sight	-		1	ⲛⲉⲩ
beginning (first)	8	ἀρχή	10	ϣⲁⲣⲡ̄ ϩⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧⲉ
great (adj.)	5	μέγας	4	ⲛⲁϭ
great (noun)	-		2	ⲛⲁϭ
greatness	-		2	ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲛⲁϭ
seek	34	ζητέω	4	ⲣ̄ⲕⲱⲧⲉ
search	-		1	ⲕⲱⲧⲉ
surround	-		2	ⲣⲕⲧⲟ

	Gospel of John		Gospel of Truth	
be strong	1	ἰσχύω	4	ⲣ̄ⲧⲱⲕ
strong (noun)	-		1	ⲧⲱⲕ
strength	-		2	ⲣ̄ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ
good (adj.)	3	ἀγαθός	6	ⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲥ
write (verb)	21	γράφω	5	ⲣ̄ⲥϩⲉⲉⲓ
beget (produce)	18	γεννάω	5	ⲣ̄ⲙⲓⲥⲉ
come	156	ἔρχομαι	4	ⲛⲛⲏⲩ
eat	5	τρώγω	4	ⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲙ
breath (verb)	1	ἐμφυσάω	2	ⲣ̄ⲛⲓϥⲉ
breath (noun)	-		2	ⲛⲓϥⲉ
taste	2	γεύομαι	3	ⲣ̄ϯⲡⲉ/ⲣ̄ⲱϩⲉ
prepare	2	ἑτοιμάζω	3	ⲣ̄ⲥⲁⲃⲧⲉ
purify	-		3	ⲣ̄ⲥⲱⲧϥ/ⲣ̄ⲧⲟⲩⲃⲟ ⲣ̄ⲧⲃⲃⲉ
purification	2	καθαρισμός	-	
clean (adj.)	4	καθαρός	-	
house	9	οἶκος/οἰκία	3	ⲏⲉⲓ

	Gospel of John		Gospel of Truth	
time	4	καιρός	3	ⲟⲩⲁⲉⲓϣ ⲕⲁⲓⲣⲟⲥ
earth	13	γῆ/χαμαί	3	ⲕⲁϩ/ⲉⲥⲏⲧ
dream	1	ὕπνος	1	ⲣⲉⲥⲟⲩⲉ
dreams	-		1	ϩⲛ̄ⲣⲉⲥⲟⲩⲉ
blessed	2	μακάριος	2	ⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ
be sick	9	ἀσθενέω	1	ⲣ̄ϣⲱⲛⲉ
sickness	2	ἀσθενεία	1	ϣⲱⲛⲉ
test (tempt)	2	πειράζω	1	ⲡⲓⲣⲁⲍⲉ
foundation	1	καταβολή	1	ⲕⲁⲧⲁⲃⲟⲗⲏ
water	21	ὑδώρ	1	ⲙⲁⲩ
crown	2	στέφανος	1	ⲕⲗⲁⲙ
righteous	3	δίκαιος	1	ⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥ
have need	4	ἔχω χρείαν	1	ⲣ̄ⲭⲣⲓⲁ
grieve (lament)	1	θρηνέω	1	ⲣ̄ⲛⲉϩⲡⲉ

	Gospel of John		Gospel of Truth	
heaven	18	οὐρανός	1	ⲡⲉ
be worthy	-		1	ⲣ̄ⲙⲡϣⲁ
worthy (adj.)	1	ἄξιος	-	
sword	2	μάχαιρα	1	ⲥⲏϥⲉ
be hungry	1	πεινάω	1	ⲣ̄ϩⲕⲉⲉⲧ

This final list of terms which the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth share in common is indeed impressive. Of special interest is the section which pertains to the protagonists in the Gnostic drama of redemption. Of course, the leading figure is "the Lord" (p. 40,8 and 14), "Jesus Christ" (p. 18,16), who is also named "Jesus" (p. 20,11; p. 24,8), "Christ" (p. 36,14), "Shepherd" (p. 31,35), "Saviour" (p. 16,38), and "Logos" (p. 16,34; p. 23,20 and 33-34; p. 26,5; p. 37,7 and 8). These fourteen references to Jesus form the basis for the Christology of the Gospel of Truth. The other important figure in the drama of redemption is "man" (p. 30,13) who discovers the divine origin of his existence by means of the appearance of Christ and thus learns that he has been predestined as one of the "children" (p. 27,13-14; p. 32,38; p. 33,39; p. 38,28; p. 43,20 and 22) of God and as one of the true "brethren" (p. 43,5) of the Father. These eight references to man form the basis for the anthropology of the Gospel of Truth. The appearance of Christ as "the truth" (John 14:6; p. 18,20) enables man to find "the way" (John 14:6; p. 18,19 and 20; p. 31,29) to the Father. This way consists of the understanding of "life" (John 14:6; p. 25,19; p. 43,10) as the existential awareness of one's true existence in the Father. The appearance of Christ frees man from his former state of forgetfulness by awakening in him the "knowledge" (John 17:3; p. 19,30; p. 25,13; p. 27,21; p. 33,35 and 38; p. 37,37) of his divine origin. In this way man is released from the power of "Error" (1 John 4:6; p. 17,15, 29, and 36) which is personified as "the Devil" (John 6:70; 8:44; 13:2; p. 33,30) and is set free to experience his true existence in "God" (John 1:12-13; 11:52; p. 34,28; p. 37,33) who is "the Father" (John 5:18; 6:27; 8:41-42; p. 37,2, 19, 24, 34, and 38). Therefore, man and the Saviour are the main protagonists in the drama of salvation. For this reason there is no need to mention any of the disciples of Christ or any of the other persons connected with his earthly ministry. Instead, the ministry of Christ is divorced from its historical roots and is reinterpreted in terms of the appearance of a heavenly messenger to man.

The use of Johannine vocabulary in the Gospel of Truth is clearly revealed in the one hundred and ten groupings that the two documents share in common. The findings presented in this section must be interpreted both negatively and positively. The use of this common vocabulary does not mean that the Fourth Gospel is the only source for each of the terms listed but that the Fourth Gospel as a whole provides the Gnostic writer with a point of departure for the development of much of his thought. The use of the Gospel of John in the Gospel of Truth does not consist of direct literary borrowings but of a similar theological approach which the Gnostic writer shares with the Fourth Evangelist. Both writers are more concerned about the real meaning of the life of Christ than about the mere facts of his ministry. Whereas John views the meaning of Christ's life from the standpoint of the historical events of his earthly ministry, the Gnostic writer is interested in Christ's life only from the standpoint of its inward and eternal significance for man. Therefore, the Gospel of John sees the life of Christ as an expression of God's redemptive activity in history, and the Gospel of Truth sees the appearance of Christ as the occasion for man's existential awareness of his true self. The use of this common vocabulary does mean that the thought of the Gnostic writer develops under the influence of Christianity. Even though some of the terms are reinterpreted, the fact that many Johannine words are used in the Gospel of Truth implies that the author of the Gospel of Truth knew the Gospel of John and that he was greatly influenced by its presentation of the life of Christ. His acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel would have come about quite naturally within the framework of the early Church. Because of the lack of polemical interest in the Gospel of Truth, this Gnostic homily may have been written by a leader of the early Church who sought to go beyond the traditional gospel pattern by emphasizing its inward and eternal meaning for man.

(b) The Absence of a Logical Progression. The similarity between the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth is not only apparent in the realm of vocabulary but also in the realm of structure. Both the Fourth Evangelist and the Gnostic writer keep returning to a few central themes and are not disturbed by questions of logical progression. When this tendency of indifference to logical progression is ignored in Johannine research, the unity of the Fourth Gospel is overlooked and a complicated theory of textual dislocations results.[121] This means that the existence of the Fourth Gospel is explained as the result of an accident-prone history. Assuming that the original roll or codex of the Fourth Gospel fell into disorder or was accidentally damaged, the entire responsibility for piecing it back together falls upon a redactor who again brings order out of chaos. The ingenuity of such a theory is in itself the best argument against it. Most of the irregularities in the structure of the Gospel, however, can be accounted for on the basis of an absence of logical progression. The Fourth Evangelist often returns to a favorite theme, e.g. life, light, truth, name, faith, and knowledge. Repetition is one of his literary methods. The indifference to logical progression of thought and composition is also a characteristic of the author of the Gospel of Truth. This characteristic has been illustrated many times in the comparison of the leading ideas which the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth share in common. For example, the idea of "the name" in the Fourth Gospel is briefly mentioned in several individual passages (John 5:43; 10:25; 12:28) and is expanded upon in one major discourse (John 17:1-26). In the Gospel of Truth the idea of "the name" is briefly mentioned in one specific instance (p. 43,21) and is expanded upon in two major passages (p. 21,25-p. 22,15; p. 38,7-p. 41,3). Therefore, the recognition of this similar indifference to logical progression gives the reader a greater appreciation for the unity of the two documents..

---

[121] W. F. Howard, The Fourth Gospel, pp. 111-127 and 297-303, and R. Bultmann, Das Johannes-Evangelium, S. 4, Anm. 2, S. 58, S. 62, Anm. 6, S. 63, Anm. 1 und 4, S. 98, Anm. 2, S. 122, Anm. 2, S. 124, Anm. 7, S. 139, Anm. 6, (continued next page)

(2) Differences Between the Two Documents. A comparison of the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth reveals that there are also some basic

---

(footnote 121 continued) S. 141, Anm. 5, S. 161-162, S. 166, Anm. 10, S. 174-175, S. 178, Anm. 3, S. 195-196, S. 209, Anm. 2, S. 215, S. 229, Anm. 2, S. 262, Anm. 2, S. 266-267, S. 269, Anm. 1, S. 286, Anm. 2, S. 292, S. 296-297, S. 301, Anm. 4, S. 302, Anm. 1, S. 319, Anm. 4, S. 321-322, S. 325, Anm. 4, S. 350, Anm. 1, S. 352, S. 355, Anm. 2, S. 369, S. 394, Anm. 8, S. 443, S. 456, Anm. 6, S. 472, Anm. 4, S. 473, Anm. 1, S. 495, S. 505, S. 525-526, S. 530-531, S. 542-543. Cf. G. H. C. MacGregor and A. Q. Morton, The Structure of the Fourth Gospel (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1961).

differences between the two documents. These differences are most apparent with respect to the development of doctrine and the continuity with the Old Testament.

(a) The Development of Doctrine. The difference between the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth is very prominent when consideration is given to the development of doctrine. This divergence will be illustrated by comparing the understanding of cosmology, Christology, anthropology, soteriology, and eschatology in the two documents.

a) The cosmology of the Gospel of John is based on the separateness of God and the world, whereas this distinction is obliterated in the Gospel of Truth. In the Fourth Gospel "the world" (ὁ κόσμος) (e.g. John 17:5 and 24; cf. John 1:10) is created by God and consists of all created beings which belong to the sphere of human life as an ordered whole.[122] While God is viewed as the Creator, all created beings are considered apart from God. The contrast between the Creator and His created beings is illustrated by the expression "this world" (ὁ κόσμος οὗτος) (John 8:23; 11:9; 12:25 and 31; 13:1; 18:36; 16:11; cf. 1 John 4:17). In this connection the world represents that which is transitory and seen as opposed to the eternal and unseen and, therefore, has no direct connection with God. The use of the term "world" in the Fourth Gospel is also extended to include the thought of an ordered whole separated from God. Instead of remaining the true expression of God's will under the conditions of its creation, the world comes to represent sinful humanity in its state of rebellion against God. In this respect the world is under the power of the Devil (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:8 and 11; cf. John 8:44 and 1 John 3:8).

---

[122] B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John,* Vol. I, pp. 64,65. Cf. E. K. Lee, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-127.

Nevertheless, God still views the world as the object of His love (John 3:16-17) and sends His only Son to take its sin upon himself (John 1:19). Whereas the world in its separation from God is the realm of "darkness" (John 1:5; 3:19), the coming of Christ is viewed as the appearance of "light" (John 1:9; 8:12; 9:5; 12:35-36 and 40) and the execution of "judgment" (John 9:39; 12:31). In this way Christ breaks the power of the Devil over the world (John 16:33). Therefore, the Johannine usage of the term "world" develops quite naturally from the original conception of *a created order apart from God* to that of *an alienated order separated from God*. This means that God's creation which is limited and transitory becomes hostile and rebellious. Because of the separation of the world from God, the redemptive work of Christ on the plane of history becomes necessary.

In the Gospel of Truth the contrast between God and the world is overlooked. The one occurrence of the term "world" (p. 24,23) in the Gnostic homily has reference to the lower form of the existence of Christ which is characterized by "deficiency" (p. 24,21). Instead of the Johannine understanding of "the world," the cosmology of the Gospel of Truth is presented in terms of "the All" (p. 17,5-7; p. 18,34-38; p. 19,8-9 and 15; p. 20,2 and 18-19; p. 21,9-10 and 19-20; p. 23,35; p. 24,3 and 5; p. 43,5) which includes not only all human creatures but also refers to the totality of the universe. This broader cosmological dimension is further implemented by the use of the terms "Pleroma" (p. 16,35; p. 35,35-36; p. 36,10; p. 41,1 and 14; p. 43,15-16), "Aeons" (p. 19,1; p. 23,1 and 16; p. 24,17; p. 27,7; p. 38,35-36), "emanations" (p. 22,37; p. 26,25 and 29; p. 27,11; p. 41,14 and 16), and "spaces" (p. 20,25; p. 25,10; p. 26,15; p. 27,10-11; p. 28,11; p. 42,8-9). These five terms have a common denominator by virtue of the fact that they all refer to the higher world of the Father. Although all men live on the earth for a time, those whom God predestines to return to Him have a divine spark in them which is only satisfied when man is reabsorbed into the divine. Those who are predestined to destruction remain in the state of forgetfulness which is produced by the forces of Error. The appearance of Christ is the execution of "judgment" (p. 25,26) because those whom God calls to return to Him become aware of their divine origin and those who are not called remain impervious to Christ. The origin of evil in the world is apparently accounted for as the work of Error who is personified as the "Devil" (p. 33,20), and the origin of good is attributed to the work of the Father who indues the world with His divine essence. Therefore, that which God creates is divine; that which He creates has its origin in Him; and that which He creates is predestined to return to Him. In contrast to the Fourth Gospel, God and the world are one in the Gospel of Truth and all that God creates has meaning only in Him.

b) The Christology of the Gospel of John is based on a delicate balance between the divinity and the humanity of Christ, whereas the Gospel of Truth emphasizes only the divinity of Christ. In the Fourth Gospel there is a balance between the divine and the human aspects of the life of Christ, i.e. "Jesus is God and Man."[123] The use of the title "Logos" (John 1:1 and 14) indicates that Jesus is indeed God, but the fact that he "became flesh" (John 1:14; cf. John 1:13; 3:6; 6:51-63; 8:15; 17:2) indicates that Jesus is also Man. Although John's use of "the Son" (John 3:17 and 35-36; 5:19-26; 6:40; 8:35-36; 14:13; 17:1) is a neutral term which emphasizes the filial relationship of Christ to the Father, the divinity of Christ is implied in the use of "the Son of God" (John 1:34 and 49; 3:18; 5:25; 10:36; 11:4 and 27; 19:7; 20:31) and the humanity of Christ is implied in the use of "the Son of Man" (John 1:51; 3:13-14; 5:26; 6:27, 53, and 62; 8:28; 9:35; 12:23 and 34; 13:31). The title "Son of Man" carries with it the idea that Jesus is not only a man but that he is also the Man, i.e. representative man in the sense that he is what all men should be and is the means of their manhood. The title "Son of God" signifies that Jesus in some sense shares the nature of God. John gives special stress to the manhood of Jesus by recalling that his name was "Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph" (John 1:45; cf. John 6:42) and that his family included several "brothers" (John 7:2 and 5). The humanity of Christ is indirectly emphasized by the fact that he felt tiredness and thirst (John 4:6-7; 19:26) and could do nothing of himself (John 5:19). The manhood of Jesus is further implemented in the Fourth Gospel by viewing him as a Jew who is called a "prophet" (John 4:19; 7:40), "Rabbi" (John 1:39 and 50; 3:2 and 26; 4:31; 6:25; 9:2; 11:8), and "Messiah" (John 1:41; 4:25). As a man, Jesus also has a human "spirit" (John 11:33; 13:21; 19:30) and a physical "body" (John 2:21; 19:31, 38, and 40; 20:12). Therefore, the relationship between the divinity and the humanity of Christ is concurrent in the Fourth Gospel. One is meaningless without the other.

---

[123] E. M. Sidebottom, *The Christ of the Fourth Gospel in the Light of First-Century Thought* (London: S. P. C. K., 1961), p. 193. Cf. H. Kahlefeld, *Die Epiphanie des Erlösers im Johannes-Evangelium* (1. Aufl.; Würzburg: Werkbund-Verlag, 1954); S. Schulz, *Untersuchungen zur Menschensohn-Christologie im Johannesevangelium; zugleich ein Beitrag zur Methodengeschichte der Auslegung des vierten Evangeliums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957); J. Ernest Davey, *The Jesus of St. John: Historical and Christological Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1958); and O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959).

When the Christology of the Gospel of John is compared with that of the Gospel of Truth, the wholeness of the Johannine emphasis upon the divinity and the humanity of Christ is ignored in favor of a fragmentary acceptance of the divinity of Christ. In the Gnostic homily Jesus is viewed as "the Logos" (p. 16,34; p. 23,20 and 33-34; p. 26,5; p. 37,7 and 8), but his "body" (p. 23,31; p. 26,8) only appears in "the likeness of flesh" (p. 31,5-6) and is also "incorruptible and incoercible" (p. 31,7-8). The fact that "nothing could block his way" (p. 31,5-6; cf. John 20:19 and 26) implies that the Gnostic writer is thinking of the spiritual body of Christ following his resurrection from the dead. It seems that the Gnostic writer only accepts the Johannine teaching concerning the divinity of Christ and uses it as a point of departure for the development of his own understanding of the revelatory appearance of Christ as a heavenly messenger. Since the author of the Gospel of Truth begins with the understanding of Christ with which the Gospel of John ends, there is no need for John's preliminary description of the earthly ministry of Christ. The important thing in the Gospel of Truth is that Christ attains the true form of his existence in the exaltation and glorification of the crucifixion, not in the resurrection. In this respect the cross is not the instrument of physical death but the means of separating the lower and higher form of Christ's existence. The task of the Gnostic Christ is to awaken man's soul to an awareness of its divine origin, not to save men from the bondage of sin. Just as the contrast between God and the world is overlooked in the Gospel of Truth, there is also no real involvement on the part of the Gnostic Christ with the sinful life of man here on this earth. Instead, Christ becomes the principle of cosmic order which emanates from the Father, not the historic person of the Gospel of John who comes into the world in the form of human flesh. This means that the Gospel of Truth views the appearance of Christ as a spiritual "ensomatosis," whereas the Gospel of John presents the coming of Christ as a physical "Incarnation." On the basis of this conclusion the proper perspective is gained with which to view the other Christological titles which the two documents share in common, i.e. "Lord" (John 4:1; 6:23; 11:2; 20:2, 13, 18, 20, 25, and 28; 21:7 and 12; cf. p. 40,8 and 14), "Jesus Christ" (John 1:17; 17:3; 20:31; cf. p. 18,16), "Jesus" (John 1:29; 2:2; 3:3; 4:1; 5:1; 6:1; 7:1; 8:12; 9:3; 10:6; 11:4; 12:1; 13:1; 14:6; 16:19; 17:1; 18:1; 19:1; 20:2; 21:1; cf. p. 20,11; p. 24,8), "Christ" (John 1:20; 3:28; 4:25; 7:26; 9:22; 10:24; 11:27; 12:34; cf. p. 36,14), "Shepherd" (John 10:2, 11, 12, 14, and 16; cf. p. 31,35), and "Saviour" (John 4:42; cf. p. 16,38). The similarity of each of these titles is in the realm of terminology, not in the realm of thought. Therefore, in the Gospel of John the divinity of Christ is balanced by his humanity as an earthly Saviour; in the Gospel of Truth the divinity of Christ is isolated from his humanity by thinking of him only as a heavenly messenger.

c) The anthropology of the Gospel of John is based on an interrelationship between predestination and free will, whereas the Gospel of Truth sets forth a one-sided doctrine of predestination. In the Fourth Gospel the human predicament is the rebellious self-assertion of man's will against God. This rebellion results in a life which is dominated by the principle of "sin" (John 1:29; 8:3 ; 8:21, 34, and 46; 9:41; 15:22 and 24; 19:8-9; 19:11). The life which is under the control of the inward principle of sin is recognizable because of the outward practice of "sins," i.e. evil thoughts, unkind words, and wrong deeds (John 8:24; 9:34; 20:23). With respect to the coming of Christ sin expresses itself as unbelief (John 3:12; 4:48; 5:38 and 47; 6:36; 8:24 and 45-46; 9:18; 10:25-26 and 37-38; 16:9). Those who seek to remain neutral (John 3:18) and those who consciously reject Christ (John 6:64) place themselves in the category of non-Christians. Only those who purposefully believe in Christ (John 2:11;

3:16 and 18; 4:39; 6:35 and 40; 7:5, 31, 38, 39, and 48; 8:30; 9:36 and 42; 11:25, 26, 45, and 48; 12:37, 42, 44, and 46; 14:1 and 12; 16:9; 17:20) fall into the category of Christians. Therefore, John divides all men into two classes on the basis of their relationship to Jesus Christ.[124] These two classes are implied not only in the distinction between those who believe and those who do not believe in Christ but also in the distinction between those "of God" (John 1:12-13; 8:47; 11:52; cf. 1 John 3:1-2; 4:4 and 6; 5:19) and those "of the Devil" (John 8:44; cf. 1 John 3:8), between those "of the Spirit" (John 3:5, 6, and 8) and those "of the flesh" (John 3:6), between those "from above" (John 3:3 and 7) and those "from below" (John 8:23), and between those "of the truth" (John 18:37; cf. John 12:36) and those "of the world" (John 15:19; 17:14 and 16). The division of all men into the categories of Christian or non-Christian is based on the interrelationship of divine foreordination and human responsibility. The Fourth Gospel clearly contains a doctrine of predestination (John 5:21; 6:65; 8:47; 13:18), but it is balanced by a doctrine of free will (John 6:37; 7:17; 20:31). This means that the divine initiative of God's calling is confirmed by the human response of man's choice. The fact that God desires all men to find the true meaning of life in Christ is implied in the Johannine phrase "whosoever believes" (John 3:15-16; 11:26; cf. John 1:17). This all-inclusive expression signifies that the Father is not willing for any to perish but desires all men to have eternal life through believing on His Son, Jesus Christ.

Upon turning to the anthropology of the Gospel of Truth the entire perspective is quite different from that of the Gospel of John. In the

---

[124] E. Percy, *Untersuchungen über den Ursprung der johanneischen Theologie, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Frage nach der Entstehung des Gnostizismus* (Lund: Hakan Ohlssons Buckdruckerei, 1939), S. 139-140. Cf. E.K. Lee, *op. cit.*, pp. 157-164.

Gnostic homily the human predicament is man's foggy existence in a state of forgetfulness. The result is a life which is dominated by the principle of "Error" (p. 17,15, 29, and 36; p. 18,22; p. 22,21 and 24; p. 26,19 and 26; p. 35,18). The life which is under the control of the inward principle of Error is recognizable because of the outward practice of "error," i.e. any concrete deviation from that which is right or correct (p. 31,25; p. 32,37). With respect to the divine origin of one's existence in the Father, Error expresses itself as "ignorance" (p. 17,10; p. 21,15, 31, and 34-35; p. 24,33-34 and 36; p. 27,33; p. 29,34; p. 30,9; p. 31,31). When Christ appears, men react to him in several ways. Those who become aware of the divine origin of their existence in the Father confirm their predestination to salvation and belong to the category of true Gnostics (p. 27,13-14; p. 32,38; p. 33,39; p. 38,28; p. 43,20 and 22; cf. p. 21, 4-5 and 23). Those who are neutral have the possibility of either salvation or destruction and belong to the category of potential Gnostics (p. 17,35; p. 27,32-35; p. 28,1-2). Those who remain oblivious of their divine origin have no hope of salvation and belong to the category of non-Gnostics (p. 17,15-17; p. 28,16; p. 31,1-3; p. 33,19-20). Therefore, the author of the Gospel of Truth divides all men into three classes on the basis of their response to the appearance of Christ. These three classes are implied in the distinction between those "who exist" (p. 39,15), those "who do not yet exist" (p. 27, 32-33; p. 28,1-2), and those "who do not exist" (p. 39,14; cf. p. 28,16; p. 31,1-2). The first two categories are also described as those "from above" (p. 22,4-5; p. 35,2; p. 42,13) and those "of the middle" (p. 17,35). The first and the last categories are further described as those "of the Father" (p. 33,39; p. 27,23-25) and those "of the Devil" (p. 33,19-20), as those "of the name" (p. 38,28; cf. p. 21,27 and 29; p. 39,16, 28, and 33) and those who have "no name" (p. 39,13; cf. p. 21,31 and 34; p. 22,1), and as those who have "root" (p. 41,17 and 26; p. 42,34 and 35) and those who have "no root" (p. 17,29-30; p. 28,16-17). The division of all men into the categories of true Gnostic, potential Gnostic, and non-Gnostic is based on a one-sided doctrine of predestination. By emphasizing the divine initiative and minimizing the human responsibility, the Gnostic writer assumes that some men are saved by nature because the divine spark of the Father is in them (p. 43,14) and that some men have no capacity for salvation because their existence is completely material (p. 31,1-2). The possibility of free will is limited to the potential Gnostics who are capable of attaining salvation on the basis of sufficient instruction from the true Gnostics (p. 32,35 - p. 33,11). Otherwise, they will remain in their ignorance and will not understand the meaning of the appearance of Christ. For this reason the potential Gnostics are of primary importance to the author of the Gospel of Truth since the salvation of the true Gnostics and the destruction of the non-Gnostics have already been foreordained by the Father. Therefore, the anthropology of the Gospel of Truth is based on a one-sided doctrine of predestination which limits salvation to the true Gnostics and the potential Gnostics in contradiction of John's emphasis on "whosoever believes." The possibility of free will is also restricted in the Gnostic homily since it can be exercised only by the potential Gnostics.

d) The soteriology of the Gospel of John is based primarily upon man's personal relationship to Christ in faith and knowledge, whereas the Gospel of Truth puts the emphasis only upon knowledge of one's divine origin in the Father. In the Fourth Gospel the attainment of salvation is possible when man has acquired sufficient knowledge of Christ in order to have a basis for expressing personal faith in him. Although John puts the emphasis on personal faith (John 1:12; 2:23; 3:18 and 36; 6:29; 9:32; 12:36), he realizes that faith must be undergirded with knowledge (John 1:10 and 49; 2:24; 10:14-15; 14:7 and 9; 17:3). The element of moral choice presupposes that one must know the one in whom he believes. This means that faith includes the comprehension of what God has done for man in Christ, i.e. the knowledge of a person, not just the knowledge of facts (John 4:53). Therefore, knowledge about Christ provides the basis for faith in Christ, and the deepening of faith presupposes the increasing of knowledge. According to John, this inseparable bond between faith and knowledge makes it possible for all men to attain salvation.

In contrast to the Fourth Gospel salvation in the Gospel of Truth is predestined for the true Gnostics; it can be attained by the potential Gnostics only on the basis of the knowledge of one's divine origin in the Father; and it cannot be attained at all by the non-Gnostics. The true Gnostics are already "the living (ones)" (p. 21,4) whom the Father "registered beforehand" (p. 21,23) in "the living Book" (p. 22,39). Because the Father created them, they are divine; they have their origin in Him; and they are predestined to return to Him. The appearance of Christ is all that is necessary to call them back to their heavenly origin. The potential Gnostics have the possibility of salvation if they are properly instructed concerning the "knowledge" (p. 19,30 and 33; p. 25,13; p. 27,21; p. 33,35 and 38; p. 37,37) of their divine origin in the Father. In this case the true Gnostics are responsible to impart to them the meaning of the appearance of Christ. The non-Gnostics remain ignorant of the Father and are totally unaware of the possibility of salvation (p. 31,3-4). Therefore, the contrast between the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth is apparent with respect to the scope and the attainment of salvation. In the Fourth Gospel salvation is possible for all men on the basis of a personal relationship to Christ in faith and knowledge; in the Gospel of Truth salvation is limited to some men on the basis of an existential relationship to the Father in knowledge.

e) The eschatology of the Gospel of John is based on the understanding of eternal life as a present experience and a future expectation, whereas the Gospel of Truth puts the emphasis only on the existential present. In the Fourth Gospel the appropriation of "eternal life" (John 3:15, 16, and 36; 4:14 and 36; 5:24 and 39; 6:27, 40, 47, 54, and 68; 10:28; 12:25 and 50; 17:2 and 3) contains the key to the understanding of eschatology. Although John views the inheritance of eternal life as a future expectation (John 5:29; 12:25; 14:19), he prefers to stress the fact that the Christian already possesses the true quality of life in the present (John 3:36; 6:47; 5:40; 6:33; 10:10 and 28). In fact, the eschatological hope takes on new meaning in the light of the present privilege (John 5:24-25; 11:25-26), and it is verified by the resurrection of Christ (John 5:29; 6:39-40, 44, and 54; 20:9). Just as the earthly life of Christ was not the end, the Christian sees beyond the present possession of life on this earth to the future consummation in "the resurrection of life" (John 5:29). Therefore, the attainment of the goal is begun on this earth when life is received from Christ by faith, and it is fulfilled in the world to come when death is overcome by life in perfect fellowship with God (John 5:24; cf. 1 John 3:14).

In contrast to John's understanding of life as a present possession and a future expectation, the Gospel of Truth puts the emphasis only on the existential present (p. 25,19; p. 43,10). The possession of "eternal life" (p. 20,30; p. 43,10-11) is foreordained for the true Gnostic and guarantees his restoration to perfect fellowship in the Father (p. 32,27 and 32). This reabsorption into the divine takes place in the present on the basis of introspection (p. 25,12) and is described as overcoming "death by life" (p. 25,18-19). The assurance of having life as a present possession means that the true Gnostics are already "the true brethren" (p. 43,5), i.e. "those who really live because they are in the true and eternal life" (p. 43, 9-11). Although the attainment of this goal is possible for the potential Gnostics, it is utterly out of the question for the non-Gnostics. Therefore, the Johannine understanding of the resurrection of Christ and the future resurrection of the Christian is overlooked in favor of man's present self-awareness of his divine origin in the Father.

(b) The Continuity with the Old Testament. The difference between the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth is also pronounced with respect to the use of the Old Testament. In the Fourth Gospel the life of Christ is viewed as the fulfilment of God's purpose for the nation Israel.[125] Even though Judaism is perverted into a system which is antagonistic to Christianity, John recognizes that the discipline of "the Law and the prophets" (John 1:45; cf. John 6:45) is the true preparation for the Messiah. The fact that "the (old) Scriptures" (αἱ γραφαί) (John 5:39) point to Christ and that the history of Israel is part of the divine purpose are clearly taught in the Gospel of John. The fulfilment of the Scriptures (i.e. the Old Testament) in the ministry of Christ is conveyed in six uses of the verb "to fulfil" (πληροῦν) (John 12:38; 13:18; 17:12; 18:32; 19:24 and 36) and one use of the verb "to complete" (τελειοῦν) (John 19:28). The preparation for the Messiah is represented in the three successive periods of the training of the Jewish people under the leadership of Abraham

---

[125] B. F. Westcott, *op. cit.*, pp. cxxxiv - cxl, and J. H. Bernard, *op. cit.*, pp. cxlvii - clvi. Cf. G. B. Stevens, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-45.

(John 8:33, 37, 39, 40, 52, 53, 56, 57, and 58), Moses (John 1:17 and 46; 3:14; 5:45-46; 6:32; 7:19 and 22-23; 8:5 ; 9:28-29), and Isaiah (John 1:23; 12:38-39 and 41). This means that Christ claimed for himself "testimonies"[126] from the patriarchal, theocratic, and monarchical stages in the life of Israel. The work of God in the history of Israel is acknowledged by John in his reference to the Jews as "His (= God's) own people" (οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτός) (John 1:11; cf. John 4:22). John also acknowledges in the eight uses of the title "Rabbi" (ῥαββί) (John 1:38 and 50; 13:2 and 26; 4:31; 6:25; 9:2; 11:8; cf. John 20:16) that the life of Jesus is itself a part of this history of Israel. Therefore, the Fourth Gospel cannot be understood apart from the continuity of God's purpose in the history of Israel and in the life of Christ.

In the Gospel of Truth the work of God in history is overlooked in favor of the existential awareness of man in himself. The allusions to the Old Testament in the Gnostic homily are indeed scarce. Two examples will be given in which a possible allusion to the Old Testament is reinterpreted existentially. First, the reference to Christ's becoming "a fruit of the knowledge of the Father" (p. 18,25-26) points forward to the "eating of the tree of life which is in the paradise of God" (Rev. 2:7) and backward to the eating of "the tree of life also in the midst of the garden (of Eden) and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil" (Gen. 2:9; cf. Gen. 2:16-17). In the Gospel of Truth the cross becomes "the tree of the knowledge of God," i.e. the means by which man becomes aware of the divine origin of his existence in God. Secondly, the two references to "the Sabbath" (p. 32,18 and 23-24) give expression to the common Jewish idea of a day of rest (Gen. 2:2-3; cf. John 5:9, 10, 16, and 18), but the Gnostic writer reinterprets this idea existentially as "the sabbath rest," i.e. the true existence of man in the Father. Therefore, the Gospel of Truth is not concerned about the continuity of God's work in the past history of Israel but is only interested in the awakening of man's self-awareness in the existential present.

---

[126] C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, pp. 28-60.

The differences between the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth make it clear that some control over the development of early Christian theology needed to be exercised. The thorough-going interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Gnostic homily from the standpoint of existentialism is illustrated by the obliteration of the distinction between God and the world so that man himself is divine. This highly specialized presupposition is also apparent in the reinterpretation of the Johannine bond of faith and knowledge in terms of the existential awareness of one's divine origin in the Father. The use of a principle of selection by the Gnostic writer expresses itself in the fragmentary development of the divinity of Christ instead of the wholeness of the Johannine teaching concerning the divinity and the humanity of Christ. This highly selective principle is also apparent in the one-sided emphasis on predestination instead of the Johannine balance between predestination and free will. By avoiding the resurrection of Christ and the future resurrection of the Christian, the Gospel of Truth "demythologizes" the Gospel of John and stresses only the existential present. By ignoring the earthly life of Christ and the preparation for it in the life of Israel, the Gospel of Truth "dehistoricizes" the Gospel of John and only emphasizes man's present history. By way of summary there are some aspects of Johannine theology which are not found in the Gospel of Truth: God's activity in history toward the goal of His redemptive purpose in Christ, the humanity of Christ as an earthly Saviour of flesh and blood, the resurrection of Christ as the confirmation of his victory over sin and death, man's creatureliness as a participant in the life of this world, man's free will as a responsible human agent, man's sin and guilt in rebellious self-assertion against God, man's attainment of salvation by faith, and man's future resurrection of life in the world to come. It now becomes clear that the development of theology in the Gospel of Truth is not compatible with the Christian religion which is presented in the Gospel of John. In spite of many similarities of terminology, the thought of the two documents is in entirely different realms. Therefore, the Gnostic religion which is presented in the Gospel of Truth is a "demythologized" and "dehistoricized" interpretation of the Gospel of John from the standpoint of existentialism.

A comparison of the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth has revealed the genius of the Christian religion and has exposed the weakness of the Gnostic religion. The understanding of the Christian religion which is presented in the Gospel of John is based upon a skillful blending of apostolic "preaching" (κήρυγμα) (e.g. Rom. 16:25; 1 Cor. 1:21; 2:4; 15:14) and Christian theology. C. H. Dodd points out the fixed outline of the historical section of the *kerygma* as it is contained in Acts 10:36-43 and Acts 13:17-41 which is clearly discernable in the Fourth Gospel:

> the ministry of John the Baptist,
> the "anointing" of Jesus with the Holy Spirit,
> His teaching and works of mercy and power in Galilee,
> His ministry in Judea and Jerusalem,
> His arrest and trial before Pilate,
> His crucifixion, burial, and resurrection.[127]

These historical facts are of primary importance in the Christian religion, and they act as a preservative of the subsequent "tradition" which attempts to convey the facts of the kerygma in the language of Christian theology. The understanding of the Gnostic religion which is presented in the Gospel of Truth is based on a complete dissociation of the kerygma and theological doctrine. In contrast to the "tradition" of the early Church which remains faithful to the kerygma, the Gnostic writer passes over the historical facts of the kerygma and develops his theology on the basis of the existential meaning of the appearance of Christ for man. The result is a perversion of Christianity which shifts the emphasis from God's historical activity in Christ to man's existential awareness in himself.

---

[127] C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development: Three Lectures with an Appendix on Eschatology and History* (London: Hodder, 1936), p. 69. Cf. Paul Althaus, *Das sogenannte Kerygma und der historische Jesus; zur Kritik der heutigen Kerygma-Theologie* (I. Aufl.; Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1958).

The findings of the present investigation are not an end in themselves but are a means to the end of evaluating related problems. The implications which are derived from a comparison of the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth have a bearing upon the past system of Valentinianism and upon the present discipline of existentialism. The relationship of the Gospel of Truth to these two important areas of research will also provide the occasion for a comparison of the present findings with the views of others who are working in the same field.

II. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH AND VALENTINIANISM

In the light of the preceding interpretation of the Gospel of John in the Gospel of Truth, it is fitting to return to the problem of authorship. The possibility that Valentinus himself wrote the Gospel of Truth is a hypothesis which has much contemporary support, but its acceptance is not essential for an appreciation of the relationship between the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Truth. Nevertheless, a more intelligent guess can be made concerning this problem on the basis of a comparison of the theology of the Gospel of Truth with the authentic teaching of Valentinus and with the fully developed Valentinian system.

(1) The Authentic Teaching of Valentinus. The original statements of Valentinus which are preserved by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom*., II, 36,2-4; II, 114,3-6; III, 59,3; IV, 89,1-3; IV, 89,6-90; VI, 52,3-4) provide the main source for the teaching of this early Gnostic leader. These statements do not contain a series of confused speculations about the mythology of the *Pleroma* but a poetical expression of the mystery of salvation in which man and the Saviour are the only protagonists.

(a) A Comparison with the Gospel of Truth. Since the Gospel of Truth is also a poetical expression of the drama of redemption in which man and the Saviour are the main protagonists, the Valentinian authorship of the Gnostic homily will be tested by a comparison with the authentic teaching of Valentinus. There is a close relationship between them with respect to cosmology, Christology, and anthropology. In each case the terms which illustrate these doctrines will be listed according to the number of occurrences in the Gospel of Truth, beginning with the highest and continuing to the lowest.

a) The cosmology of the authentic teaching of Valentinus and of the Gospel of Truth is based upon a common affinity between the higher world of the Father and the lower world of man. This teaching will be illustrated by comparing the cosmological terms which pertain to God and the world.

	Authentic Teaching		Gospel of Truth	
Father	1	πατήρ	137	ⲓⲱⲧ

	Authentic Teaching		Gospel of Truth	
name (divine)	4	ὄνομα	42	ⲣⲉⲛ
name (appellation)	-		2	ⲣⲉⲛ
Aeon (living)	1	αἰών	-	
Aeons	-		6	ϩⲛ̄ⲁⲓⲱⲛ
Lord	-		4	ϫⲁⲉⲓⲥ/ ⲛⲉⲧⲡ
rule (be lord)	1	κυριεύω	1	ⲣ̄ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ϫⲁⲉⲓⲥ
God	3	θεός	2	ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ
god	1	θεός	-	
world	2	κόσμος	1	ⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ

The similarity is striking with respect to the relationship between God and the world. The designation "God" in the original teaching of Valentinus (Fr. 2, 5, and 6; cf. Fr. 1) is also found in the Gospel of Truth (p. 34,28; p. 37,33). The designation "Father" occurs in the Valentinian teaching (Fr. 2), but it is much more prominent in the Gospel of Truth (e.g. p. 16,33 and 36; p. 17,1, 10, and 31). Whereas the author of the Gospel of Truth uses the verb "to rule" (p. 38,38) along with the designation "Lord" (p. 40,8 and 14; cf. p. 20,17; p. 25,31), the Valentinian teaching uses only the verb "to rule" (Fr. 4). In the authentic teaching of Valentinus the contrast is between "the living Aeon" (= the higher world of the Father) (Fr. 5) and "the world" which is inferior (= the lower world of man) (Fr. 4 and 5). In the Gospel of Truth the contrast is between "the Pleroma" which is inhabited by "the Aeons" (e.g. p. 16,35; p. 19,1) and "the world" which is deficient (p. 24,23). Another similarity is apparent with respect to the giving of the divine "name" to man (Fr. 1 and 5; cf. p. 38,28-30). A minor difference between the Valentinian teaching and the Gospel of Truth can be seen in relation to the inhabitants of the higher world of the Father. In the original statements of Valentinus they are called "angels" (Fr. 1); in the Gospel of Truth they are called "emanations" (e.g. p. 21,37; p. 26,25 and 29). Nevertheless, the cosmology of the Valentinian fragments is clearly compatible with that of the Gospel of Truth.

b) The Christology of the authentic teaching of Valentinus and of the Gospel of Truth is based on a similar exaggeration of the divinity of Christ. This teaching will be discerned in a comparison of the terms which pertain to the name and the nature of Christ.

	Authentic Teaching	Gospel of Truth
the Son	1 ὁ υἱός	11 ⲡϣⲉⲣⲉ
the beloved Son	-	2 ⲡϣⲣ̄ⲙⲛ̄ⲣⲓⲧ
the Beloved	1 ὁ ἠγαπημένος	-
Jesus	1 Ἰησοῦς	2 ⲓⲏ̄ⲥ
divine nature	1 θεότητα	-

The similarity is remarkable with respect to the names of Christ. In both cases he is called "the Son" (Fr. 2; cf. p. 24,14; p. 30,25) and "Jesus" (Fr. 3; cf. p. 20,11; p. 24,8). In the Valentinian teaching he is referred to as "the Beloved" (Fr. 6); in the Gospel of Truth he is referred to as "the beloved Son" (p. 30,31-32) and "the Son whom he desires" (= the beloved Son) (p. 40,24-25). The main similarity, however, pertains to the teaching concerning the nature of Christ. Although the original statement of Valentinus uses the specific term "divine nature" (Fr. 3), the same thing is implied by several passages in the Gospel of Truth. The understanding of Christ as "the Logos" (e.g. p. 16,34) is developed only in terms of his divinity, i.e. "he came in the likeness of flesh, with the result that nothing could block his way since it (= his flesh) is incorruptible and incoercible" (p. 31,4-8). In other words, Christ is a heavenly messenger who emanates from the Father (p. 16,34-35; p. 37,9; p. 38,8-9). The interpretation of the crucifixion of Christ (p. 18,24; p. 20,25 and 27) also allows his divinity to overshadow his humanity, i.e. the cross becomes the symbol for the separation of the higher form of his existence (= his divine nature) from the lower form of his existence (= his human nature). Therefore, the Christology of the Valentinian fragments clearly agrees with that of the Gospel of Truth.

c) The anthropology of the authentic teaching of Valentinus and of the Gospel of Truth is based upon a similar one-sided doctrine of predestination. This teaching will become apparent by comparing the terms which pertain to the nature of man.

	Authentic Teaching		Gospel of Truth	
heart	7	καρδία	7	ϩⲏⲧ
children	1	τέκνα	6	ϩⲛ̄ ϣⲏⲣⲉ

	Authentic Teaching		Gospel of Truth	
life	-		3	ⲱⲛϩ̄
eternal life	1	ζωὴ αἰώνιος	2	ⲱⲛϩ̄ ⲛ̄ⲁⲛⲏϩⲉ
man (earthly)	-		4	ⲣⲱⲙⲉ
Man (pre-existent)	2	Ἄνθρωπος	-	
men (earthly)	2	ἄνθρωποι	-	
death	2	θανατός	4	ⲙⲟⲩ
Devil	-		1	ⲇⲓⲁⲃⲟⲗⲟⲥ
demons	1	δαιμόνα	-	
evil spirit	1	πονηρὰ πνεῦμα	-	
spirits (evil)	1	πνεύματα	-	
seed	1	σπέρμα	1	ⲥⲡⲉⲣⲙⲁ
immortal	1	ἀθάνατοι	-	

The similarity here can be discerned in a common approach to predestination which is based upon man's possession of the divine spark of the Father. In both cases the divine essence in man is referred to as "the seed of the substance from above" (Fr. 1) and as "the seed of the Father" (p. 43,14). This divine spark dwells in the "heart" (Fr. 2 and 6; cf. p. 19,22 and 35; p. 24,1; p. 26,6; p. 31,11; p. 32,31; p. 43,15) of the "children" (Fr. 4; cf. p. 27,13-14; p. 32,38; p. 33,39; p. 38,28; p. 43,20 and 22) of God and provides the basis for "eternal life" (Fr. 4; cf. p. 20,30; p. 43,11). The authentic teaching of Valentinus adds a distinctive emphasis in the insistance upon the fact that the children of eternal life are "immortal ... from the very beginning" (Fr. 4). Since not all men are predestined by the Father to eternal life, the implication is that others are doomed to destruction. In the original statement of Valentinus destruction is the end for those who do not recognize the manifestation of the Son and remain a dwelling-place of "demons" and "evil spirits" (Fr. 2). In the Gospel of Truth destruction awaits those who do not recognize the appearance of Christ and remain a dwelling-place of the Devil (p. 33,20). In both cases the existence of man in himself without the divine essence of the Father is called eternal "death" (Fr. 4; cf. p. 25,18; p. 42,20). A minor difference between the Valentinian teaching and the Gospel of Truth can be seen in the creation of "the pre-existent Man" by the angels as the prototype of the creation of man on this earth (Fr. 1; cf. p. 27,14; p. 30,13). The use of mythological language to explain the creation of man is avoided in the Gospel of Truth. Nevertheless, the anthropology of the Valentinian fragments is clearly compatible with that of the Gospel of Truth.

The remarkable agreement between the authentic teaching of Valentinus and the Gospel of Truth indicates that they share a common theological perspective and gives the impression that they are both the work of the same author. The fact that a term occurs once in the Valentinian fragments is significant since the frequency would be much higher if more of the authentic teaching of Valentinus had been preserved by Clement of Alexandria. Even on the basis of this limited evidence, however, the hypothesis concerning the Valentinian authorship of the Gospel of Truth is supported.

(b) An Evaluation of Current Research. The main exponents of the Valentinian authorship of the Gospel of Truth are W. C. van Unnik, G. Quispel, H.-C. Puech, and K. Grobel. A comparison of the authentic fragments of Valentinus with the Gospel of Truth has demonstrated the credibility of their view. Therefore, it is appropriate to conclude the discussion of the teaching of Valentinus himself with an evaluation of the two most important works which maintain that Valentinus is the author of the Gospel of Truth.

The first significant discussion of the Gospel of Truth to appear in English was F. L. Cross's translation and compilation of three studies by H.-C. Puech, G. Quispel, and W. C. van Unnik.[128] This volume is very useful for its comprehensive survey of the facts pertaining to the discovery of the Jung Codex and its description of the other writings in this Codex besides the Gospel of Truth. There is a basic consistency of approach to the Gospel of Truth in the three articles since each writer begins with the presupposition that Valentinus himself wrote the homily in Rome before the development of a typically Gnostic system by his followers. Whereas W. C. van Unnik suggests A.D. 140-145 as the date of composition, H.-C. Puech and G. Quispel prefer to date the homily about A.D. 150. The latter date seems more likely in view of the prominence of Gnostic thought in the treatise. At first glance the Gospel of Truth appears to be more Christian than it actually is because of the extensive use of Christian terminology. Perhaps this prominent use of New Testament vocabulary led van Unnik to overrate the Christian character of the document and, therefore, to date it in the early years of Valentinus' teaching in Rome. If the date is placed at A.D. 150, it means that Valentinus arrived at the position set forth in the Gospel of Truth over a period of about ten years of teaching in Rome. The implication is that his earlier years there (A.D. 140-145) were spent in harmony with the orthodox teaching of the early Church, that his middle years (A.D. 145-155) were spent in adventurous existential speculation on the Christian religion, and that his later years (A.D. 155-160) were spent in antagonism to the restraints of orthodoxy and in the development of the Gnostic religion. During the first period at Rome, he could have been considered as a candidate for the Bishopric; by the time of the third period, he was considered to be a heretic. The composition of the Gospel of Truth must have come in the middle of the second period since the extremes of orthodoxy and heresy are avoided in this attempt to reinterpret Christianity from the standpoint of existentialism. In the Gospel of Truth Valentinus attempts to set forth the living essence of Christianity in a form uncontaminated by the Jewish envelope in which it had been received, i.e. the past tradition of the Scriptures (= the Old Testament) and the future eschatological expectation.[129] Instead, he chose to express his religious conviction in terms which would be more suitable to the cosmology and philosophy of his age, and in the process he transformed the Christian religion into the Gnostic religion.

---

[128] H.-C. Puech, "The Jung Codex and the Other Gnostic Documents from Nag Hammadi," G. Quispel, "The Jung Codex and Its Significance," and W. C. van Unnik, "The 'Gospel of Truth' and the New Testament" in F. L. Cross, *The Jung Codex*, pp. 11-129. Cf. R. McL. Wilson, "Review Article of F. L. Cross, *The Jung Codex*," *N. T. S.*, 1 (1955), 309-313; Luke Willems, "Review Article of F. L. Cross, *The Jung Codex*," *East. Ch. Q.*, 11 (1955), 94-100; and Otto A. Piper, "Review Article of F. L. Cross, *The Jung Codex*," *T. Tod.*, 15 (1958), 167-170. Cf. footnotes 38 and 39.

---

[129] F. C. Burkitt, op. cit., p. 21, points to Paul's sermon at Athens (Acts 17:22-31) as an example of the main stock-in-trade with which Gentile Christianity started, i.e. the authority of the Old Testament and the eschatological hope of the Second Coming: "The first part is an attack on 'idolatry' quite in the manner of the Old Testament; this leads up to an announcement of the Last Judgment and the Parousia of Jesus" (p. 27). In this way Burkitt accounts for the vogue of the Gnostic movement in the second century as the result of the failure of the early Christian eschatological expectation. The Gospel of Truth seems to confirm this early theory of F. C. Burkitt. R. M. Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, pp. 27-38, also explains the impetus toward Gnostic ways of thinking in terms of the decline of the Jewish apocalyptic-eschatological hope. More recently, however, Grant has turned away from the Jewish background to the possibility that Gnosticism arose out of Christianity. Cf. W. R. Schoedel, "New Gnostic Papyri," Rel. L., 31 (1961-62), 107, note 42.

The first commentary on the Gospel of Truth to appear in English was the pioneer volume of K. Grobel entitled _The Gospel of Truth: A Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel_. It contains a brief introduction, a literal translation, and a copious conglomeration of critical notes. The notes are extremely valuable as an introduction to many of the linguistic and theological problems of the document. This work is primarily useful as a working-tool for further study of the Gospel of Truth and succeeds in opening up many aspects of the homily which otherwise would remain hidden. The main weakness, however, is the lack of a total theological perspective from which to view the individual problems. By looking only at isolated passages, Grobel tends to emphasize the affinity of the homily to Christianity and to minimize the presence of definite Gnostic terminology. This Christianizing tendency is very apparent in his unwillingness to translate the Gnostic terms "emanations" and "spaces."[130] By thus neutralizing the importance of these terms, Grobel is free to emphasize the orthodoxy of the homily and to make it into a hybrid Gospel of John. Whereas W. C. van Unnik overemphasizes the Christian character of the Gospel of Truth by exaggerating the use of similar New Testament terminology, K. Grobel does the same thing by minimizing the use of distinctive Gnostic terminology.

---

[130] K. Grobel, _op. cit._, p. 65, note 113; p. 81, note 171; p. 99, note 229; p. 105, note 255; p. 107, note 260 and 263; p. 111, note 272 and 273; p. 193, note 606. He betrays this Christianizing tendency again in a discussion of Grant's anthology of Gnostic sources when he says that "not everyone will be certain that the Gospel of Truth should be included" - K. Grobel, "Review of R. M. Grant, _Gnosticism_," _Rel. L._, 31 (1962), 484. Cf. W. W. Isenberg, "Review of K. Grobel, _The Gospel of Truth_," _J. Rel._, 43 (1963), 60-61.

In either case this weakness would have been avoided by going beyond the realm of terminology to a comprehensive treatment of the thought of the homily as a whole. A comparison of the thought of the Gnostic homily with the Gospel of John makes it clear that this document cannot be reconciled with the Christian religion and that it sets out on a new path of its own which is the Gnostic religion.

(2) The Fully Developed Valentinian System. In contrast to the few authentic statements of Valentinus preserved by Clement of Alexandria, the information concerning the fully developed Valentinian system consists of the secondary accounts of the Church Fathers. The most important of these polemical writings is the *Adversus Haereses* of Irenaeus which presents a complete picture of the Valentinian system in the opening section of Book One (*Adv. Haer.*, I, 1,1 - I, 8,4). The fact that Irenaeus reports on the system of the disciples of Ptolemy, not of Valentinus, has been recognized for some time.[131] In other words, there are four stages of development from *Valentinus* to *Ptolemy* to his *disciples* to *Irenaeus*. If the Gospel of Truth is the work of Valentinus himself, then it is to be expected that a process of development will be detected from the Gospel of Truth to the full-scale Valentinian system. This means that certain ideas which appear in the form

---

[131] The best discussion of the Valentinian system from the standpoint of Irenaeus (A.D. 180-188) can be found in F. M.-M. Sagnard, *op. cit.*, pp. 140-198. Acknowledging his dependence upon W. Förster's *Von Valentin zu Herakleon*, Sagnard argues convincingly that the main part of the treatise of Irenaeus exactly reproduces the doctrine of Ptolemy. A useful English exposition of the Valentinian system from the standpoint of Hippolytus (A.D. 225-230) is presented by F. Legge, *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity: Being Studies in Religious History from 330 B.C. to 330 A.D.*, Vol. II (Cambridge: University Press, 1915), pp. 95-133. H. Jonas, *Gnostic Religion*, pp. 179-197, summarizes the main tenets of Valentinian doctrine, and J. N. Sanders, *op. cit.*, pp. 55-66, presents the Valentinian system in the light of the influence of the Fourth Gospel. Cf. footnotes 16 and 19.

of seed-thoughts in the Gnostic homily will appear in their full-grown form in the teaching of Ptolemy, Heracleon, and Theodotus.

(a) A Comparison with the Gospel of Truth. The vague allusions in the Gospel of Truth to the full-scale Valentinian system will illustrate the process of development from the early philosophical thought of Valentinus to the later mythological doctrine of his followers. This development occurs with respect to cosmology and anthropology.

a) The cosmology of the Gospel of Truth provides a point of departure for the shifting of the emphasis of Valentinian thought from philosophy to mythology. There is no mention in the Gnostic homily of a thirtyfold complex of named Aeons, of the intervention of the Demiurge, or of the adventures of Sophia-Achamoth. Instead, there are only nameless "Aeons," "emanations," and "spaces" in the Gospel of Truth. This undeveloped stage of cosmology is most apparent in the use of "depth," "Mother," and "cross." In the Gospel of Truth the term "depth" (βάθος) (p. 22,25; p. 35,15; p. 37,7-8; p. 40,27) is an attribute of the Father whose true character is revealed by Christ (p. 37,7-12). By starting from the seed-thought of the "depth" of the Father's thought which is unfathomable by man, the full-grown idea appears in the later Valentinian system as *Bythos*, the highest Aeon of the *Pleroma* who is the one supreme source of all things (Ptolemy in Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I, 1,1; I, 11,1). Instead of viewing the "Depth" as a mere abstraction, he is also called the "Forefather" who manifests Himself openly in a succession of thirty descending Aeons. In the Gospel of Truth there is a puzzling reference to "the Father and the Mother" (p. 24,7) in which the latter term is a veiled designation for the Holy Spirit. The fact that a male and female figure are placed alongside of one another in the Gnostic homily is a seed-thought which is expanded into the elaborate system of male and female Aeons called "syzygies" in the full-scale Valentinian system (Ptolemy in Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I, 18,2; V, 31,1). These "pairs" of Aeons descend from the "Depth" who also has a spouse called "Silence." In the Gospel of Truth the Father gives the emanations "their destinies" (ⲚⲞⲨⲦⲰϢ) (p. 41,19-20), i.e. he prescribes the limits of their operations. The Coptic noun ⲦⲰϢ is a translation of the Greek noun ὅρος which literally means "limit" or "boundary." This seed-thought becomes the technical term *Horos* in the full-grown form of the Valentinian system and designates the boundary between the higher world of the *Pleroma* and the lower world of matter. The influence of Christianity is unmistakable in both the Gospel of Truth and the fully developed Valentinian system when this principle of separation is identified with the "cross" of Christ (Ptolemy in Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I, 5,1; Marcus the Magician in Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I, 14,6; Heracleon in Origen, *Com. on John*, X, 33). As a result of the adventures of Sophia-Achamoth in the full-scale Valentinian system, *Stauros* becomes the guard which keeps thirty Aeons within the *Pleroma*. Therefore, the philosophical teaching of Valentinus in the Gospel of Truth is greatly exaggerated by his followers and is transformed into bizarre mythological speculation.

b) The anthropology of the Gospel of Truth provides a point of departure for the systematization of Valentinian thought. The delineation of three classes of men in the Gospel of Truth has been clearly demonstrated. This seed-thought is allowed to blossom in the fully developed Valentinian system by giving specific labels to each of the groups. The true Gnostics become the "pneumatics" (πνευματικοί), the potential Gnostics the "psychics" (ψυχικοί), and the non-Gnostics the "hylics" (ὑλικοί) (Theodotus in Clement of Alexandria, *Exc. Theod.*, 56,2-3).

In both the Gospel of Truth and the later Valentinian system all men are dominated by the power of Error (Heracleon in Origen, *Com. on John*, XIII, 20), but some are predestined to overcome their forgetfulness by the knowledge of their true origin in the Father (Ptolemy in Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I, 21,4). Others are not so fortunate and are doomed to destruction. Thus, it is clear that the original teaching of Valentinus in the Gospel of Truth becomes systematized in the writings of his followers.

The development of doctrine from the original teaching of Valentinus to the mythologized systematization of his followers Ptolemy, Heracleon, and Theodotus is supported by the Gospel of Truth. The nascent presuppositions of the Gnostic homily come to life in a dramatic way in the subsequent writings of the followers of Valentinus. For the most part this process of development can be explained as a movement from philosophy to mythology.

(b) An Evaluation of Current Research. The question of development within Valentinianism is a vexed problem which has not yet received a uniform answer. It is at this point that the contribution of Hans Jonas's monumental two volume work entitled *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist* needs to be re-examined. If the date of A.D. 150 is accepted for the composition of the Gospel of Truth by Valentinus, the absence of mythology in the document implies that he was still largely motivated by Christian presuppositions within the framework of the early Church in Rome. H. Jonas, however, interprets the absence of mythology in the Gnostic homily quite differently. He starts with the assumption that Valentinian thought is first and foremost mythological and bases this view on the Valentinian system which is preserved by Irenaeus. By dating the Gospel of Truth about A.D. 160, he sees this treatise as a later philosophical summary of the meaning of the earlier mythology. According to this interpretation, the presupposition of Jonas that Gnosticism develops "from mythology to mystical philosophy" is supported by the Gospel of Truth. The weaknesses of this interpretation, however, are in the lack of philological evidence and the misunderstanding of chronological development. In the first place, Jonas is a philosopher and thinks in terms of sweeping generalities instead of letting "particulars" lead to "universals." G. Quispel points out this philological weakness in the work of Jonas when he says:

> It is indisputable that Jonas has taken a characteristic trait of Gnosticism into account i.e. the conception of man as an alien in the world . Nevertheless, it seems that he neglects the data of philology which is indispensable to this kind of research. The phenomenological method is dangerous in that it loses sight of the importance of the philology which interprets the texts, indicates the sources from which the author has drawn, and determines the influence which he has undergone.[132]

In contrast to the Jewish orientation of Jonas, the Gospel of Truth clearly attests the influence of Christianity upon Valentinian thought. In the second place, Jonas interprets the entire Gnostic movement on the basis of philosophy developing from mythology instead of mythology developing from philosophy. R. M. Grant challenges this conclusion from the standpoint of chronological development when he says:

> The picture of Valentinianism which Jonas presents requires reconsideration (1) because in most of Irenaeus' description we have Ptolemaeus, not Valentinus himself, and (2) because we now know from the Gospel of Truth that Jewish and Christian (especially the latter) influences were exceedingly important in Valentinus' system. Jonas's abstract picture does not correspond to Valentinus' doctrine .... The investigation itself treats the mythological as primary, the philosophical as secondary. This axiom is by no means proved by the actual history of gnostic thought, and it neglects the extent to which elements regarded by

---

[132] G. Quispel, "La conception de l'homme dans la gnose valentinienne," Eranos-Jahrbuch, 15 (1947), 253. Cf. footnotes 43 and 44.

> Jonas as mythical can actually be explained as philosophical.[133]

In other words, the Gospel of Truth does not support the earlier view of Jonas because it is an explanation of the mystery of salvation, not of the mythology of the Pleroma. Only a philosophy can explain a mystery; a mythology may embrace a philosophy, but it does not explain it. Therefore, the philosophical presentation of the Gospel of Truth appears to be the original and primary form of the teaching of Valentinus, and the expanded mythological presentation of the disciples of Ptolemy which is preserved by Irenaeus appears to be derivative and secondary.

In spite of these limitations the scholarly world is greatly indebted to Hans Jonas for systematically expounding for the first time the existential character of Gnostic thought. He understands the unifying principle of all Gnostic thought as the tendency of man to know his true self through introspection. For this reason the phenomenon called Gnosticism is not dealt with "broad wise" by way of classification but "depthwise" by way of fathoming its bottom. Anyone who merely describes and classifies various objectified conceptions understands nothing of the meaning of these Gnostic texts existentially. Instead, he must expose himself to the understanding of existence which underlies these individual, concrete conceptions. Therefore, Jonas maintains that the very foundation of Gnosticism is "a definite attitude to life and an interpretation of human existence derived from it."[134]

---

[133] R. M. Grant, "Review Article of H. Jonas, Gnosis und spätantiker Geist," J. T. S., 7 (1956), 308-313, esp. 313. Cf. A. D. Nock, "Review Article of H. Jonas, Gnosis und spätantiker Geist," Gnom., 12 (1936), 605-612.

[134] H. Jonas, Gnosis und spätantiker Geist, 1. Band, S. 80. H.-M. Schenke, "Besprechung von H. Jonas, Gnosis und spätantiker Geist," T. L. Z., 11 (1959), 813-820, insbes. 816, agrees with Jonas that "the question of the attitude to life is the key to the understanding of Gnostic mentality." In his analysis (continued next page)

The understanding of the Gnostic religion in the Gospel of Truth is apparently based on the same existential presupposition. This important aspect of the thought of the Gospel of Truth calls for a consideration of another implication of the present investigation, i.e. the relationship between the Gnostic homily and the existentialism of Rudolf Bultmann.

III. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH AND EXISTENTIALISM

Human existence has always been a problem of man, but the answer to the problem is quite different in the Christian religion and in the Gnostic religion. According to Christianity, man's understanding of his present existence is only meaningful in relation to the past work of God in history and in relation to the future fulfilment of existence in heaven. In the Gnostic religion man's understanding of his present existence in itself is all that is necessary for salvation, and it is divorced from past history and future fulfilment.

(1) The Existentialism of the Gospel of Truth. The existential orientation of the thought of the Gospel of Truth will be summarized in terms of the self-understanding of the present, the dehistoricizing of the past, and the demythologizing of the future. This analysis will prepare the way for a re-examination of Rudolf Bultmann's interpretation of the Fourth Gospel.

(a) Self-Understanding of the Present. The unifying theme of the Gospel of Truth is the self-understanding of man's present existence which

---

(footnote 134 continued) of the existential basis of Gnostic thought Jonas does not disguise his philosophical allegiance to Oswald Spengler (S. 13, 70, and 73-74) and Martin Heidegger (S. 17, Anm.1; S. 90-91 and 107). Cf. H. Jonas, "Gnosticism and Modern Nihilism," _So._ _Re._, 19 (1952), 430-452.

is based on the knowledge of his divine origin in the Father (p. 18,7; p. 19,6 and 13; p. 22,36 and 38; p. 23,21; p. 24,16; p. 26,29; p. 27,11; p. 30,23-24). It is in the act of true self-understanding that men come to know that the origin of their existence is in the Father, i.e. "they come to know (that) they were (already) known" (p. 19,32-33). This present experience of existential awareness is based on the past foreordination of the Father which gives the true Gnostics the inner capacity for knowledge. Although "they were (already) known" by God to be creatures of divine origin, this knowledge of their true self is inaccessible as long as they remain in the state of "forgetfulness" (p. 17,24, 33, and 36; p. 18,1, 6, 8, 11, and 18; p. 20,38; p. 21, 36) which is produced by "Error" (p. 17,15, 29, and 36; p. 18,22; p. 22,21 and 24; p. 26,19 and 26; p. 35,18). This is why Christ emanates from the Father as a heavenly messenger (p. 16,33; p. 18,4-5 and 25; p. 20,38) whose appearance awakens men from the sleep of forgetfulness and brings them to a consciousness of their heavenly origin (p. 19,30 and 33; p. 25,13; p. 27,21; p. 33,35 and 38; p. 37,37). When men become aware that their true existence is actually "of Him" (= rooted in the Father) (p. 33,32), then they are able "to find rest" (= to undergo the present experience of reabsorption into the divine) (p. 33,36). This means that the wholeness and completeness of man's existence is experienced not in himself but in the self-understanding of his divine origin in the Father (p. 25,12-15). In other words, the true Gnostic discovers that his true self is divine. Therefore, the Gospel of Truth teaches that man's present experience of self-understanding is actually the awakening in man of the divine essence of God.

(b) Dehistoricizing of the Past. The existential orientation of the Gospel of Truth precludes the past work of God in the history of Israel and in the earthly ministry of Christ. In the first place, there is no continuity between the present work of God in man and the past events of the life of Israel. The possible allusions to the Old Testament usage of "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil" (Gen. 2:9) and to "the sabbath" (Gen. 2:2-3) are both reinterpreted existentially. In the Gospel of Truth Jesus becomes "the fruit of the knowledge of the Father" (p. 18,25-26) on the cross when the higher form of his existence is reunited with the Father. This same process is re-enacted in the life of the true Gnostic who is thus allowed to enter into the "Sabbath" (p. 32,18 and 23-24), i.e. the heavenly rest of the Father which is experienced in the existential present. Since the background for the idea of "the tree of life" (e.g. Rev. 2:7) and of "the sabbath" (e.g. John 5:9) can also be explained on the basis of the New Testament, it is very doubtful that any use of the Old Testament can be substantiated in the Gospel of Truth. At any rate it is certain that the Gnostic writer is not interested in the past work of God in the history of Israel. In the second place, there is no continuity between the present work of God in man and the past events of the life of Christ. The possible allusion to the encounter of Jesus with the scribes and Pharisees (John 6:59; 18:20; cf. p. 19,19-25) is also reinterpreted existentially. The important thing is not the historical event but the appearance of Christ as a teacher who communicates the knowledge of man's true existence in the Father. For this reason there is no Sitz im Leben for the teaching of Jesus (p. 20,28; p. 21,2; p. 23,20), and there are no references to any disciples or other followers of Jesus. The definite allusion to the crucifixion of Christ (John 19:17, 19, 25, and 31; cf. p. 18,24; p. 20,25 and 27) is also reinterpreted existentially. In the Gospel of Truth "the cross" is not the instrument of physical suffering and death but the symbol of separation between the lower and upper realm of existence. Since this understanding of the death of Christ is all that is necessary to set men free from the lower form of their existence, there is no need for the resurrection of Christ. With respect to the history of Israel and the ministry of Christ, it becomes apparent that the Gospel of Truth is only interested in the awakening of man's true self in the existential present, not in the awareness of God's activity in the historic past. Therefore, the existentialism of the Gospel of Truth is based on a "dehistoricizing" tendency which dissociates the Gnostic religion from the past.

(c) Demythologizing of the Future. The existential orientation of the Gospel of Truth also precludes the future fulfilment of man's eschatological expectation in the resurrection of the body. The understanding of "eternal life" (p. 20,30; p. 43,11) in the Gnostic homily is based on man's present possession of the divine essence of the Father. In contrast to the Fourth Gospel there is no mention of a futuristic eschatological event which includes the resurrection of the body (John 5:29; 6:39, 40, 44, and 54). According to the Gospel of Truth, man's reabsorption into the divine takes place in the existential present on the basis of introspection (p. 25,12) and is described as overcoming "death by life" (p. 25,18-19). The assurance of having life as a present possession means that the true Gnostics are already "the true brethren" (p. 43,5), i.e. "those who really live because they are in the true and eternal life" (p. 43,9-11). This means that the Gospel of Truth is again only interested in the awakening of man's true self in the existential present, not in the fulfilment of man's life in the future resurrection of the body. Therefore, the existentialism of the Gnostic homily is based on a "demythologizing" tendency which dissociates the Gnostic religion from the future.

By way of conclusion, the Gospel of Truth presents a "dehistoricized" and "demythologized" answer to the problem of human existence which puts the emphasis on man's self-understanding of his divine origin in God. The weakness of this answer lies in the separation of *kerygma* and theology which results from a shift of perspective from God's historical activity in Christ to man's existential awareness in himself. Such an interpretation of human existence can no longer be identified with Christianity and appropriately deserves the label of Gnosticism.

(2) The Existentialism of Rudolf Bultmann. The problem of human existence finds contemporary expression in the theology of Rudolf Bultmann. Acknowledging his indebtedness to the existential philosophy of Martin Heidegger,[135] Bultmann thinks that Christianity is primarily concerned with human existence. He attempts to penetrate to the core of what the Christian religion says about man's existence by breaking through all the obscuring supernatural and mythological claims and presentations. The important thing for Bultmann is the significance which Christian theology has for man's authentic existence. Therefore, he is not interested in theology as a purely historical pursuit in which one simply recounts the happenings of the past. Instead, he conceives of the theological task as one which discerns and elaborates upon the implications of the event of God in Christ. This means that the emphasis is placed on what these past events mean for man's life today. The fact that existentialism is the key to the understanding of the thought of the Gospel of Truth and the theology of Rudolf Bultmann calls for a closer examination. They will be compared

---

[135] R. Bultmann, "The Historicity of Man and Faith," in *Existence and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann* (New York: Meridian Books, 1960), pp. 92-110, a translation of "Die Geschichtlichkeit des Daseins und der Glaube," *Z. Th. K.*, n. f. 11 (1930), 339-364. Cf. John Macquarrie, *An Existentialist Theology: A Comparison of Heidegger and Bultmann* (London: S. C. M. Press, 1955).

at the point where they come closest together, i.e. in the interpretation of the Gospel of John.

(a) Self-Understanding of the Present. Bultmann approaches the Fourth Gospel with the assumption that all theological statements are statements about man and his possibilities for understanding his existence. The basis for this "self-understanding"[136] is revealed by Christ as "the light" (John 1:4-5) and is perceived by men as the true kind of "life" (John 1:4). The "true light" (John 1:9; cf. 1 John 2:8) is not the light of literal day which makes orientation in the external world possible but the state of having one's existence illuminated. This is an illumination in and by which a man understands himself and achieves a self-understanding which opens up "the way" to the Father (John 14:6). "Darkness" (John 1:5), then, means that a man does not seize this possibility and that he shuts himself up against God. Instead of understanding himself as a creature, he claims for himself a self-sovereignty that belongs to the Creator alone. In contrast to "light" which is the basis of true self-understanding, "darkness" is thus illusory self-understanding in which man turns away from the origin of his existence and revolts against "the truth" (John 14:6). This "truth" is not the teaching about God transmitted by Jesus but is God's very reality revealing itself in Jesus. The fact that the Incarnate Word is "full of grace and truth" (John 1:14) means that in him God's reality encounters men as a gracious gift. Since God is the sole reality, then

---

[136] R. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, presents the idea of "self-understanding" as *Selbstverständnis* (S. 32, 240, und 298), *Verständnis seiner selbst* (S. 25, 41, und 210), and *Sichverstehen* (S. 26, 34, und 194). Cf. Otto Schnübe, *Der Existenzbegriff in der Theologie Rudolf Bultmanns: Ein Beitrag zur Interpretation der theologischen Systematik Bultmanns* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959), and H. P. Owens, *Revelation and Existence: A Study of the Theology of Rudolf Bultmann* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1957), pp. 37-39 and 91-110.

"eternal life" (John 17:3) is simply openness to God and to him who makes God manifest. The opposite is eternal "death" (John 5:24) in which man withdraws from reality and falls into unreality. By repudiating his origin from God, then his origin is actually Nothing. Therefore, the terms "light," "truth," and "life" explain each other since they all derive their meaning from the search for human existence and denote the possibility of existence from God. They all imply that only in the knowledge of his creaturehood and of his divine origin can man achieve true self-understanding.

The similarity between Bultmann's existential interpretation of the Gospel of John and the interpretation of the Gospel of John in the Gospel of Truth is striking. On the surface there is a basic difference between them which Bultmann readily admits. For the Gnostic this self-understanding is possible because the Saviour brings the γνῶσις of man's true self, of his origin, of his situation in the world as a stranger, and of the way back to his heavenly home. For the Christian this new existential self-understanding is a matter of "faith," a concept which is always expressed by the verb πιστεύειν in the Fourth Gospel. It is true that both Christianity and Gnosticism agree in attributing man's liberation to the act of God. In Gnosticism that which is freed is the true self, the spark of light in man, whereas for Christian faith man is freed for his authentic self by being freed from himself. This means that the Gnostic is one "saved by nature" (φύσει σοζόμενος) and that the Christian is one "saved by faith" in Christ. Growing out of the cosmological dualism of Gnosticism, the Christian's actual realization of his authentic self emerges in the Gospel of John as a dualism of decision, i.e. the choice between life and death, belief and unbelief, and light and darkness (John 3:16-19). C. B. Ashanin summarizes this aspect of Bultmann's thought in concise terms when he says:

> The human self stands involved in the problem of existence which stands over against him. In *Kerygma*, man's possibilities through Christ are revealed. *Christ*, through *Kerygma*, calls man to decide. In making the decision man *acquires* a *Begriff* (a sort of gnosis), by which *man is* enabled to meet *the problem* of existence and overcome it.[137]

As in the Gospel of Truth, the experience of self-understanding in the Gospel of John according to Bultmann takes place within man. From this subjective perspective the term "faith" in the Fourth Gospel means the same thing as "knowledge" in the Gospel of Truth. Moreover, both Bultmann and the author of the Gospel of Truth implement the problem of human existence by "dehistoricizing" the past and "demythologizing" the future.

(b) Dehistoricizing of the Past. Bultmann approaches the Fourth Gospel with the assumption that the Gospel of John is strongly influenced by pre-Christian Gnostic thought instead of acknowledging the influence of the Gospel of John upon the development of Christian Gnosticism. This means that it is the Gnostic religion, not Christianity, which brings renewal to the Hellenistic world.[138] For this reason Bultmann interprets the

---

[137] C. B. Ashanin, "Toward an Understanding of Rudolf Bultmann's Theology: A Short Historical Review of German Theology," *J. Rel. T.*, 15 (1957/58), 147-154, esp. 154. Cf. Erik Dinkler, "Existentialist *Interpretation* of the New Testament," *J. Rel.*, 32 (1952), 87-96.

[138] R. Bultmann acknowledges his indebtedness to Hans Jonas for this understanding of the Gnostic religion in the Preface of *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, 1. Band (1954), S. vii: "I would like to say that *I ... have not learned* so much for a real knowledge of the historical phenomenon of *Gnosis* from any previous investigation in this area ... as from this one." *He accepts* the fantastic conclusion of Jonas that Gnosticism was the common religion of the Hellenistic world and its Eastern neighbors which includes not only Christian Gnosticism but also the Hermetica, Neopythagoreanism, Philo, Origen, Mandaeism, Manichaeism, the later parts of the Avesta, the literature of the Mystery Religions, and magical literature. Instead of such a generalized historical analysis in which Gnosticism becomes synonymous with the use of mythical language and imagery, the present writer prefers to think of Gnosticism in a more limited sense as a philosophical formulation of Christianity with a particular emphasis on knowledge. In this connection the Gospel of (continued next page)

Fourth Gospel in the light of the pre-Christian "Gnostic Redeemer-myth" which was formulated by Richard Reitzenstein.[139] The fact that the Gnostic Redeemer-myth lay ready to serve as a vehicle for the expression of Johannine thought is clearly implied when Bultmann says:

> The Gnostic Redeemer-myth of the Incarnation of the pre-existent Son and of his exaltation, by which he prepares the way for his own into the world of light, provides the terminology for the Christology of John.[140]

In the Gospel of John Jesus appears as the pre-existent *Logos* whom the Father clothes with authority and sends into the world (John 1:1 and 14). Appearing on earth as a man, he speaks the words which the Father gives him and accomplishes the works which the Father has commissioned him to do (John 14:10). He comes as the "light," the "truth," and the "life" by

---

(footnote 138 continued) Truth provides a good example of the way in which Gnosticism develops within the framework of the early Church. Perhaps the choice between pre-Christian and Christian Gnosticism is not "either-or" but "both-and." A.D. Nock, "Review Article of J. Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*," *Gnom.*, 12 (1936), 612, after admitting that he has been left in a "terminological fog" by the work of Jonas, recognizes a positive value in the investigation: "A phenomenon such as *Gnosis* can be studied in a vertical section or in a horizontal section. The work of Dr. Jonas should be of value to those who are looking at *Gnosis* in the second way and wish to follow a topic through the different related movements. But they should not regard it as in any sense superceding Harnack, de Faye, or Burkitt. These names represent different lines of approach; they are all valuable."

[139] R. Reitzenstein, *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium: Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber, 1921), insbes. S. 70. An extensive excursus is devoted to the Gnostic Redeemer-myth in W. Schmithals, *Die Gnosis in Korinth: Eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956), S. 82-134. Cf. Carsten Colpe, "Die gnostische Gestalt des Erlösten Erlösers," *Isl.*, 32 (1956), 195-214.

[140] R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, Vol. I (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954), p. 175. R. Bultmann, *Primitive Christianity in Its Contemporary Setting* (New York: Meridian Books, 1956), p. 197, likewise says that "the most thorough-going attempt to restate the redemptive work of Christ in Gnostic terms is to be found in the Gospel of John." Cf. W. Howard, *The Fourth Gospel*, pp. 250-258, and P. H. Menoud, *L'Évangile de Jean*, pp. 34-39.

bringing through his words and works light, truth, and life to men and by calling "his own" (John 1:11-12) to himself. His coming thus accomplishes the separation between those who hear his voice and those who do not understand his speech (John 10:3 and 14). Then he leaves the world and takes leave of his own whom he commits to the Father's care (John 17:11). His departure also belongs to the work of redemption, for by his elevation he prepares the way for his own to enter the heavenly dwelling-places of the Father (John 14:2-3).

The similarity between Bultmann's understanding of the Gnostic Redeemer-myth and the Christology of the Gospel of Truth is remarkable. There is, however, a basic difference between them which Bultmann is quick to point out. In Gnosticism the Redeemer is a divine being whose appearance releases pre-existent human selves from the world of matter and leads them to the world of light which is above. In the Gospel of John the Redeemer is a definite human being in history, Jesus of Nazareth, who calls men to himself and who is lifted up and glorified in order that his life may continue to have significance for all men as a present reality through the Holy Spirit. In this way Bultmann maintains that the Incarnation and the death of Christ constitute a unity in the Gospel of John as the "coming" (= Incarnation) and the "going" (= death) of the Son of God (John 3:13-15). The double meaning of Jesus's death which is contained in the terms "to lift up" and "to glorify" includes the completion of his life-work and the release from his commission which enables him to return to the glory which he formally had in pre-existence (John 6:62; 17:5). Because his death itself is already his exaltation, Bultmann concludes that "his resurrection cannot be an event of special significance."[141] In other words, the Easter-stories of John 20-21 are only intended to be confessions of the Easter faith

(John. 20:29). In agreement with the Gnostic Redeemer-myth the important thing for Bultmann's interpretation of Johannine Christology is the bare fact of Revelation, i.e. the proposition that the Revealer has come and gone, has descended and has been re-exalted. This Revelation is the affirmation and fulfilment of the human longing for life, for self-understanding, and for true reality, and it can only be apprehended in the response of faith (John 6:29).

Although Bultmann acknowledges that the Revealer is a definite historical person, his existential orientation causes him to turn away from God's past work in history to man's present understanding in himself. It is his avowed purpose to make faith completely independent of history so that faith "cannot be dependent upon a historian's labor."[142] Bultmann advocates that "Jesus in his thought of God - and of man in the light of this thought - 'de-historized' God and man; that is, released the relation between God and man from its previous ties to history (history considered as the affairs of nations)."[143] In rejecting the traditional idea of history, Bultmann introduces a new understanding of history in terms of existential or personal history:

> The meaning of history lies always in the present, and when the present is conceived as the eschatological present by Christian faith the meaning in history is realized .... Do not look around yourself into universal history, you must look into your own personal history. Always in your present lies the meaning in history, and you cannot see it

---

[141] R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. II (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955), p. 56. Because the Johannine teaching concerning the resurrection of Christ is not compatible with the Gnostic Redeemer-myth which forms the basis for the Christology of the Fourth Gospel, Bultmann passes over the verbs "to rise" (John 20:9) and "to be raised" (John 21:14) by attributing them to the work of a later ecclesiastical redactor. Cf. R. Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes, S. 530-531 und 546.

[142] R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I, p. 26.

[143] Ibid., p. 25.

> as a spectator, but only in your responsible decisions. In every moment slumbers the possibility of being the eschatological moment. You must awaken it.[144]

The way in which Bultmann applies this existential understanding of history to his interpretation of the Fourth Gospel is closely related to the work of the Spirit:

> He [= John] does not consider the task of the Church's proclamation to be the transmitting of the historical tradition about Jesus. The testimony of the Church is the testimony of the Spirit that was given it. The Spirit, as the "other Counselor," is Jesus' substitute (14:16). And when the Spirit "reminds" believers of all that Jesus said (14:26), this reminding is not an evocation of the past by historical reproduction. Rather, it is that which makes present the eschatological occurrence which with him burst into the world (16:8-11). When it is said that the Spirit "will guide you into the whole truth" (16:13), that means that the Spirit teaches the believer by the light of this occurrence to understand each particular present hour.[145]

Bultmann's emphasis on the self-understanding of man's present existence again calls to mind the Gospel of Truth. The only differences is that the Christian bases his self-understanding upon the response of faith, whereas the Gnostic bases his self-understanding on the knowledge of his divine origin. In both cases the emphasis is shifted from the historic past to the existential present. In attempting to make the Gospel intelligible to modern man by means of existentialism, Bultmann is in danger of severing the Gospel from the events which gave rise to it. At any rate his use of the "Gnostic Redeemer-myth" to explain the Christology of John is certainly misleading. The entire theory is a hypothetical reconstruction of Richard Reitzenstein and is based on later Gnostic sources which presumably had pre-Christian antecedents. C. H. Dodd is fully aware of the limitation which is involved in the use of these sources when he says:

---

[144] R. Bultmann, History and Eschatology (Edinburgh: University Press, 1957), p. 155.

[145] R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. II, p. 69. R. Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes, S. 437-440, also maintains that the title Paraclete also stems from Gnostic thought.

> There is no Gnostic document known to us which can with any show of probability be dated - at any rate in the form in which alone we have access to it - before the period of the New Testament. The attempts made by Reitzenstein and others to recover supposed earlier and pre-Christian sources are entirely speculative. Whatever plausibility they possess depends on the establishment of a prior probability that the non-Christian elements are anterior to the Christian elements in the documents as they stand.[146]

The use which Bultmann makes of later Gnostic sources to explain the earlier development of Johannine theology is certainly anachronistic. Moreover, it has been demonstrated by Wilhelm Thüsing[147] that the "coming" and "going" of Jesus in the Gospel of John can be understood apart from the Gnostic Redeemer-myth. Instead, the descent and exaltation of Jesus are expressions of the Johannine understanding of "Holy History." The descent takes the form of the Incarnation, and the exaltation consists of both the crucifixion and the resurrection as the climax of God's redemptive purpose for man.

(c) Demythologizing of the Future. Bultmann approaches the Gospel of John with the assumption that Christian theology must no longer use mythical language if the Gospel is to speak to the modern scientific mind. The result is the elaborate scheme of "demythologizing"[148] which frees the New Testament of a futuristic apocalyptic-eschatology which belongs to the pre-scientific age. The process of demythologizing is carried to its logical conclusion in the Fourth Gospel by the complete elimination of every trace of apocalyptic eschatology. The last judgment is no longer an imminent cosmic event since it is already taking place in the coming of Jesus and in his summons to believe (John 3:19; 9:39; 12:31). Likewise, the raising of the body of the believer at the last day (John 6:39, 40, 44, and 54; cf. John 5:29) is a later embellishment of the primitive Church since John knows nothing of a futuristic eschatological event. The conclusion which Bultmann reaches with respect to demythologizing the future clearly reiterates the teaching of the Gospel of Truth when he says:

---

[146] C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 98. C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935), p. 201, maintains that the Hermetic literature in its present form is scarcely earlier than the third century A.D. A. F. Loisy, *Le mandéisme et les origines chrétiennes* (Paris: E. Nourry, 1934), p. 19, affirms that the Mandaean literature in its present form is post-Islamic, and the origin of the sect is assigned on good evidence to the fifth century A.D. F. C. Burkitt, *The Religion of the Manichees* (Cambridge: University Press, 1925), pp. 12-16, does not list any source for the study of Manichaeism which dates before the fourth century A.D.

[147] W. Thüsing, *Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1960). Cf. Heinrich Ott, *Geschichte und Heilsgeschichte in der Theologie Rudolf Bultmanns* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1955), and Theophil Müller, *Das Heilsgeschehen im Johannes-Evangelium: Eine exegetische Studie, zugleich der Versuch einer Antwort an Rudolf Bultmann* (Zürich: Gottheft Verlag, 1961).

> Hence the importance of the New Testament mythology lies not in its imagery but in the understanding of existence which it enshrines. The real question is whether this understanding of existence is true. Faith claims that it is, and faith ought not to be tied down to the imagery of New Testament mythology.[149]

If *Gnosis* is substituted for faith, the result is a clear statement of the way in which the Gospel of Truth interprets the Fourth Gospel.

The basic weakness of Bultmann's scheme of demythologizing is in the area of hermeneutics. The methodology of interpretation which he uses is a "pre-understanding" (*Vorverständnis*) which knows in advance what the only possible meaning of the text will be. This pre-understanding is actually a kind of self-understanding which views every text of the New Testament from the standpoint of existentialism. Helmut Thielicke points out this inadequacy when he says:

---

[148] The original statement of the problem of "demythologizing" first appeared in English as R. Bultmann, "New Testament and Mythology" in H. W. Bartsch, *Kerygma and Myth: A Theological Debate*, Vol. I (London: S. P. C. K., 1953), pp. 1-44. More recent statements of the problem are R. Bultmann, *Jesus Christ and Mythology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958), H.W. Bartsch, *Kerygma and Myth: A Theological Debate*, Vol. II (London: S. P. C. K., 1962), and R. Bultmann, "On the Problem of Demythologizing," *J. Rel.*, 42 (1962), 96-102. Cf. John Macquarrie, *The Scope of Demythologizing: Bultmann and His Critics* (London: S. C. M. Press, 1960), and Schubert M. Ogden, *Christ Without Myth: A Study Based on the Theology of Rudolf Bultmann* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961).

[149] H. W. Bartsch, *Kerygma and Myth*, Vol. I, p. 11.

> The pre-understanding is not simply "pre" in a temporal sense, as something which I am already bringing to the *kerygma*, but it has in addition a concrete *postulatory power*, and has its effect on the content of that which is to be recognized as legitimate *kerygma* at all. It works like a sieve, through which the kerygmatic contents are filtered. Through this sieve there passes only that which has a valid claim to truth, namely, that which can become the content of a self-understanding. *For Bultmann, what happens is not history, but only consciousness.*[150]

This hermeneutical weakness of Bultmann's demythologizing will be illustrated by summarizing his view of the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ. The cross is not just an event of the past which can be contemplated in detachment but the eschatological event in and beyond time, for as far as its meaning for faith is concerned, it is an ever-present reality. Likewise, the resurrection is not an event of past history with a self-evident meaning. An historical fact which involves a resurrection from the dead is utterly inconceivable. Instead, the cross and the resurrection form a single, indivisible cosmic event which brings judgment to the world and opens up for men the possibility of authentic life. In this way the resurrection is not a mythological event adduced in order to prove the saving efficacy of the cross but an article of faith. Faith and unbelief are never blind, arbitrary decisions. They offer men the alternative between accepting or rejecting that which alone can illuminate the understanding of their true selves. Therefore, it is apparent that Bultmann is not concerned with the historical character of the kerygma but with the meaning of the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ for the self-understanding of man. At this point Bultmann's hermeneutical method has definite limitations. In the first place, the principle of pre-understanding is a normative principle foreign to the Bible which works as a criterion brought in from the outside. In the second place, the principle of pre-understanding does not reckon seriously with the possibility that as regards the kerygma much more happens in heaven than in the human mind which forms the self-understanding. In the third place, this principle does not take into consideration that which is much more important than man's dying and rising with Christ, i.e. the fact that Christ died and rose again quite independently of man as the climax of God's redemptive purpose in history.

---

[150] H. Thielicke, "Reflections on Bultmann's Hermeneutic," *Exp. T.*, 67 (1956), 154-157, esp. 156. Cf. Otto A. Piper, "Review Article of H. W. Bartsch, *Kerygma and Myth*," *T. Tod.*, 11 (1954), 107-117, and B. H. Throckmorton, *The New Testament and Mythology* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959), pp. 13-144.

It now becomes clear that certain aspects of Bultmann's interpretation of the Fourth Gospel have much in common with the underlying presuppositions of the Gospel of Truth. Assuming that the Gospel of Truth represents a genuine attempt to "dehistoricize" and "demythologize" the Gospel of John in order to make Christianity more compatible with the cosmology and philosophy of the Hellenistic world, then this much is certain. The interpretation of the Fourth Gospel which it presents was rejected by the Church Fathers because it dissociated the kerygma from theology and then substituted for the kerygma an existential understanding of Christianity. Bultmann's attempt to illuminate man's self-understanding by removing the past events and the futuristic eschatology from the Fourth Gospel also loses sight of the redemptive work of God in history. In fact, the attitude which he embraces is close to Gnosticism itself since there is no distinctive kerygma in his theology. As in the Gospel of Truth, an existential encounter of man with God through faith (= Gnosis) is substituted for the mythological framework of Jewish apocalyptic. If this Gnostic attempt at "demythologizing" the Gospel of John had retained the essential Christian message, then Bultmann would be right in insisting upon the same approach. But since the existential interpretation of the Gospel of Truth does not remain true to the kerygma, then it would seem that Bultmann has been contradicted by his own methodology. Although there is always a need for interpreting the New Testament to the modern scientific mind, this does not mean that the kerygma has to be expressed existentially. In the light of the Gospel of Truth the whole problem of Entmythologisierung needs to be re-examined. In contrast to the existential interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the thought of the Gospel of Truth and in the theology of Rudolf Bultmann, the Fourth Gospel itself presents the kerygma in terms of God's redemptive purpose for man in history. Therefore, the distinctiveness of Christianity is contained in the relationship between God's past redemptive history and man's present personal history in the experience of faith.

The contributions of the present investigation will be summarized in the form of a brief recapitulation. There are basically three areas which the study has illumined, i.e. methodology, Valentinianism, and existentialism. The first contribution is the formulation of a new method for the interpretation of the Gospel of John in the Gospel of Truth which is based upon a comparison of the thought of the two documents. A comparison of terminology is obviously inadequate. On the one hand, the terminology of the Gospel of John appears to be more Gnostic than Christian; on the other hand, the terminology of the Gospel of Truth appears to be more Christian than Gnostic. Taken by themselves, the mere comparison of words could be misleading. When individual terms are viewed within the larger context of the thought of the document as a whole, this danger will be avoided. The second contribution is the attestation of the origin of Valentinian thought within the framework of the early Church. If the Gospel of Truth was written by Valentinus, then a great deal more is known about the thought of this early Gnostic leader. If the date A.D. 150 is taken seriously, then the Gospel of Truth is influenced by the Gospel of John, not _vice versa_. This means that the Gospel of Truth adds further evidence to the Christian origin of Gnosticism and causes suspicion to be raised concerning the pre-Christian origin of Gnosticism. The third contribution is the demonstration of the inadvisibility of interpreting the Gospel of John from the standpoint of existentialism. When God's past history is severed from man's present history, the distinctiveness of Christianity is overlooked and the _kerygma_ is dissociated from theology. The appearance of this tendency in the thought of the Gospel of Truth and the theology of Rudolf Bultmann causes serious questions to be raised.

The interpretation of the Gospel of John in the Gospel of Truth has made it possible to take a new look at early Christian theology in the middle of the second century. The issues which were alive then are still being debated today. It is in this kind of living tension between the fact of revelation in the Christian religion and the reality of development in Christian theology that the Christian of every age must seek to find his way.

APPENDIX

A TRANSLATION OF THE GOSPEL OF TRUTH

p. 16

The gospel (εὐαγγέλιον) of (the) truth is joy to those who (by means of it - the gospel) have received grace from the Father of Truth, in order to come to know Him (= the Father) by the power of the Logos (= the Saviour) who has come from the Pleroma (πληρωμα) (and) who is in the thought and the mind (νοῦς) of the Father; this (person) is the one who is called the "Saviour" (σωτηρ), for that is the name of the work which He is to accomplish for the salvation of those who

p. 17

were ignorant of the Father, whereas the designation "gospel" (εὐαγγέλιον) is the revelation of hope (ἐλπίς), since it signifies the discovery for those who seek Him (= the Father). Therefore (ἐπειδή), the All sought for Him from whom it had come forth, and the All had been inside of the Illimitable, Inconceivable (One) who is superior to every thought, because the ignorance of the Father produced terror and fear. And (δέ) terror became dense like a fog, so that no one was able to see. Because of this, Error (πλάνη) became strong. It worked on its hylic substance (ὕλη) vainly, because it did not know the Truth. It (= Error) molded (it) (= its hylic substance) into a fashioned form (πλάσμα), trying to make in beauty the equivalent of Truth (of which it was naturally ignorant). This, then, was not a humiliation for the Illimitable, Inconceivable (One). For (γάρ) the terror and the forgetfulness and the figure (πλάσμα) of falsehood were as nothing, whereas the established Truth is unchanging, unperturbed, (and) completely beautiful. For this reason look with scorn (καταφρονεῖτε) upon Error (πλάνη). It behaves in this manner - it has no root in itself (and) it originated in a fog with respect to the Father. Upon coming into existence, it (= Error) produces works (ἔργον) and forgetfulnesses and fears, in order (ἵνα), by these means, to beguile those of the middle (= the potential Gnostics) and to take them captive (αἰχμαλωτίζειν). The forgetfulness of Error (πλάνη) was not revealed. It did not become

p. 18

[thought] beside the Father. Forgetfulness did not originate with the Father, although it came into existence because of Him. That which came into existence through Him (= the Father) is knowledge. This was revealed (as the gospel) in order that (ἵνα) forgetfulness might be destroyed and that the Father might be known. Since (ἐπειδή) forgetfulness came into existence because the Father was not known, then (τότε) if they come to know the Father, forgetfulness from that moment on ceases to exist. This (is) the gospel (εὐαγγέλιον) of Him whom they seek, (the gospel) which has been revealed to the perfect (ones) through the mercies of the Father. This hidden mystery (μυστήριον) (= the gospel) has enlightened those who were in darkness by means of Jesus Christ. He (= Jesus) has enlightened them out of forgetfulness (and) has given (them) a way (into knowledge). And (δέ) this way is the truth which he (= Jesus) has taught them. For this reason Error (πλάνη) became angry with him, (so) it persecuted him. It was endangered by him, (so) it annihilated him. He was nailed to a (cross of) wood, (but) he became a fruit of the knowledge of the Father. However, it (= the fruit) did not perish because it was eaten. And (δέ) he caused those who ate it to be joyful because of this discovery. As for Him, He (= the Father) found them in Himself, and they found Him in themselves, this Illimitable, Inconceivable (One), the Father, this Perfect (One) who created the All, since the All was in Him and the All had need of Him, because He had retained in Himself their perfection which He had not given to the All. The Father did not have envy (φθονεῖ). What (kind) of envy (φθόνος) is there then between Him and His members (μέλος)?

p. 19
For (γάρ) if the Aeons had [done]
this, they would not have been able to approach
the Father, because He retained
their perfection in Himself,
giving it to them as a (way of) returning to Him
and as a knowledge unique in
perfection. He is the one who has created
the All, for the All was in Him,
and the All had need of Him.
Just as a man who has
many offspring (lit. forth through him)
who are ignorant of him
desires to be known and
loved by them, (so the Father desires) thus (to be known and loved).
For (γάρ) of what did the All have need,
if not (ει μητι) of knowledge?
The Father became a
quiet and devoted guide.
He (=Christ) appeared in the midst of their schools (and) spoke
the word as a teacher.
Those who were wise (σόφος)
in their own estimation came to him,
in order to put him to the test (πειράζειν).
But (δέ) he put them to shame because
they were empty. They hated
him because they were not actually
wise men. After all these,
the little children also came to him,
to whom belongs
the knowledge of the Father. When they (=the little children)
became strong,
they became acquainted with the forms
of the appearance of the Father. They came to know;
they were known. They were glorified; they
gave glory. In their heart was revealed
the living Book
of the Living (Ones) which stands written
in the thought and in the mind (νοῦς)

p. 20 [of the] Father and (which), from before the foundation (καταβολή) of the world (lit. All), was in that incomprehensible part of Him (= the Father). This (Book) is that which no one is able to take, since (ἐπειδή) it is revealed for Him who will take it and be slain. No one from those who believed in salvation could appear until that Book became accessible (lit. came into their midst). For this reason the compassionate, faithful (one) (πιστός), Jesus, showed mercy by taking the sufferings upon himself until he took that Book, since (ἐπειδή) he knew that his death meant life for many. Just as the fortune (οὐσία) of the deceased master of the house remains hidden as long as (the) will (διαθήκη) has not been opened, so also (it is with) the All which was hidden as long as the Father of the All was invisible (ἀόρατος). This is one who originated (lit. is) out of Himself, out of whom all ways (into knowledge) come. For this reason Jesus appeared (and) clothed (lit. veiled) himself with that Book. He was nailed to a (cross of) wood, (but) he made known (lit. affixed) the decree (διάταγμα) of the Father on the cross (σταυρός). Oh, such great teaching when he humbles himself (lit. brings himself down) unto death, (already) being clothed with eternal life. When he had divested himself of these perishable rags (= the body which had become of no use to him), he put on incorruptibility which no one is able to take away from him. When he (= Jesus) had entered the empty spaces of terrors (= the material world), he placed himself at the head of those who had been stripped by forgetfulness and thus became both knowledge and perfection. He proclaimed what is in the heart

p. 21

[of the Father], in order that the instruction [might be given] to those who should [receive] instruction. And (δέ) those who should receive instruction (are) the living (ones) who are inscribed in the Book of the Living (Ones). They receive instruction for themselves alone; they are received by the Father when they return to Him again. Since (ἐπειδή) the perfection of the All is in the Father, it is necessary (ἀνάγκη) that the All reascend (lit. go upward) to Him. Then (τότε), if one has knowledge, he receives the things which belong to him (lit. what is his) and puts them on. For (γάρ) the one who is ignorant has a deficiency, and it is something important (lit. great) of which he has need, for (ἐπειδή) he lacks that which would make him perfect. Since (ἐπειδή) the perfection of the All is in the Father, it is necessary (ἀνάγκη δέ) that the All reascend (lit. go upward) to Him and that each one receive the things which belong to him (lit. what is his). He (= the Father) registered them beforehand, having chosen (lit. prepared) them in order to join (lit. give) (them) to those who had come forth from Him. Those whose name He (= the Father) foreknew were called at the end, so that (ὡς) (the) one who has knowledge is he whose name the Father has pronounced. For (γάρ) he whose name has not been pronounced remains ignorant. For how would one hear, if his name has not been called? For (γάρ) he who remains ignorant to the end is a creature (πλάσμα) of forgetfulness, and he will be destroyed with it. If (it were) not (so), why do the wretches not have

p. 22

a name? (Why) do they not hear (lit. have) the call (lit. voice)? Thus (ὥστε), if anyone has knowledge, he is a being from above. If he is called, he hears, answers, and turns toward Him who calls him, and ascends to Him and knows how he is called. Since he has knowledge, he does the will of the One who called him. He desires to please Him (and) finds (lit. receives) rest. The name of the One (= the Father) becomes his. He who has knowledge in this manner perceives whence he came and whither he is going. He perceives as one who has been drunk (and) becomes sober (lit. has turned from his drunkenness). When he had returned to his own self, he set in order those things which are his own. He (= Jesus) brought many back from Error (πλάνη). He went before them to their own places, from which they had departed when they had received Error (πλάνη) on account of the depth (βάθος) of Him who surrounds every place, whereas there is nothing which surrounds Him. It was a great wonder that they were in the Father without knowing Him and that they were able to come out (from the Father) alone (= without assistance), since (ἐπειδή) they were not able to grasp (lit. receive) (Him) for themselves and to know the One in whom they were. For (γάρ) His will had not come forth from Him thus. For (γάρ) He revealed it (= His will) (to the world) as knowledge and with it were associated its emanations. This is namely the knowledge of the living Book which he revealed to the

p. 23

world (lit. Aeons) (αἰών) at the end of his [creations],
just as it was revealed [in the beginning],
for there are no letters (τόπος for τύπος) of
voices (= vowels) nor (οὐδέ) characters which
lack a voice (= consonants),
so that (ἵνα) one may read them and
think on those things which are vain.
Instead (ἀλλά), they are characters of
truth which one can only pronounce (lit. speak)
if he knows them himself. Each
character is a perfect thought
like a perfect Book
which consists of characters
They have been written by
the Unity, since the Father
has written them, in order that (ἵνα) the world (lit. Aeons) (αἰών)
might come to know the Father
by means of His characters. His wisdom (σοφία)
meditates (μελετᾶν) on
the Word (= Logos); His teaching gives him
expression; His knowledge
is made manifest;
His forbearance (?) is like
a crown upon him; His
joy is mingled
in him; His glory
is exalted in him; His image (?)
he has revealed
His rest he has
enclosed within him; His love (ἀγάπη)
is embodied (- σῶμα) in him; His
faith has encompassed him. The Word (= Logos) thus
goes forth from the Father
into the world (lit. the All) as the fruit

p. 24
[of] his heart and
expression (?) of His will.
Moreover, he (= the Logos) supports the All; he
chooses them (= the Aeons) (in order to rescue them); and he also takes
5 the form (?) of the All.
He (= the Logos) purifies it (= the All) and causes it to return
to the Father and to the Mother -
Jesus (= subject) - through (?) the boundlessness of
his kindness (lit. sweetness). The Father opens His bosom,
10 and (δέ) His bosom
is the Holy Spirit (πνεῦμα). He (= the Father)
reveals His hidden self -
His hidden self is
His Son - in order that (ἵνα)
15 the Aeons (αἰών) may know Him
through the mercies of the Father
and stop taking pains to search for
the Father (and) find their rest (lit. rest themselves)
in Him, since they know
20 that this is (indeed) the Rest. After
he had filled up the deficiency (of knowledge by means of instruction),
he did away with
the (outer) form (σχῆμα) (= eliminated his emptiness). His
form (σχῆμα) (of deficiency)
is the world (κόσμος) in which
he (= the Son) served.
25 For (γάρ) the place where there is envy and
strife is deficient,
but (δέ) the place where there is unity
is completeness. Since (ἐπειδή) the deficiency originated
because they did not know
30 the Father, if they come
to know the Father, then (τότε) the dificiency will cease to exist
from that moment on. As
one's ignorance
disappears then (τότε) of itself
35 when he (= the true Gnostic) gains knowledge
- namely his ignorance - (and)
as darkness disappears
when light appears,

p. 25

so the deficiency is also eliminated by completeness. Moreover, the (outer) form (σχῆμα) is no longer apparent from that moment on, but (ἀλλά) will disappear in the fusion with the Unity (= the Father), for (γάρ) their works remain equal for them at the time when the Unity will complete the spaces (= all the Aeons). By means of the Unity each one will receive his (true) self. By means of knolwedge he (= the true Gnostic) will purify himself out of a diversity of nature into a unity, while he consumes matter (ὕλη) within him like a flame and darkness by light, (and overcomes) death by life. Now if these things have happened to each one of us, then it is fitting for us to think about the totality (lit. the All), so that (ἵνα) the house will be holy and silent for the Unity. (It is) like people who moved from places where they had jars (σκεῦος) which were not good (any more) in one place (τόπος). They usually break them, and (in spite of that) the master of the house does not suffer loss, but (ἀλλά) he rejoices, for (γάρ) in place of these jars (σκεῦος) which were defective (are) those which are full (and) complete, for this is the judgment (κρίσις) which has come

p. 26

from above (and) which has judged everyone as a drawn, two-edged sword cutting on this side and that. When the Word (= Logos) which is in the heart of those who pronounce it had appeared (among men) - it was not only a sound, but (ἀλλά) also took on a body (σῶμα) - a great disturbance occurred among the jars (σκεῦος), for some had been emptied (but) others had been filled. For behold, some had been provided (with contents but) others had been overturned; some had been purified (but) still others had been broken. All (the) spaces were shaken and disturbed, because they had neither solidarity nor (οὔτε) stability (στάσις), in the course of which Error (πλάνη) became enraged since it did not know what it should do. [It] was afflicted; it grieved; it tormented itself because it understood nothing. Ever since (ἐπειδή) knowledge which is its annihilation has approached it, Error with all its emanations has been empty, since there is nothing in it. (Then) truth appeared. All its (= truth's) emanations came to know it (= truth); they greeted (ἀσπάζεσθαι) the Father in truth and perfect power which united them with the Father. For (γάρ) everyone (who has the capacity for knowledge) loves truth because truth is (the) mouth of the Father. His tongue is the Holy Spirit (πνεῦμα) who joins

p. 27

him (= everyone who loves truth) to truth (and) attaches him by his tongue to (the) mouth of the Father, when (= at which time) he should receive the Holy Spirit (πνεῦμα). This (truth) is the manifestation of the Father and His revelation to the Aeons (αἰών). He revealed that which was hidden by Him (= His hidden self) and explained it. For (γάρ) who is it who exists except (εἰ μήτι) by the Father alone? All (the) spaces are emanations from Him. They knew Him because they had come from Him like children (come) from a perfect man. They did (not) know Him (= the Father) because they had not yet received a form (μορφή) nor (οὔτε) had they yet received a name, every one of which (= form and name) the Father produces. Then (τότε) they receive form (μορφή) and knowledge from Him. For, although they are in Him, they do not know Him. However, the Father is perfect; he knows every space which is in Him. If he wishes, he permits whomever he desires to appear by giving him form (μορφή) and by giving him a name. And he gives him a name and causes that they (= those on whom form and a name have been bestowed) come into being from those who, before they originate, do not know the one who created them. However, I am not saying that those who do not yet exist are nothing. Instead (ἀλλά), they are

p. 28

in Him who will desire that they come into existence, when he wishes, at some future time (καιρός) (= it is predestined that they come into being in the future). Before all things have been revealed, He knows, nevertheless, what He will produce. However, the fruit (καρπός) which has not yet been revealed does not know anything, nor (οὐδέ) does anything either. In the same manner all (the) spaces which are also in the Father come from the Existing One who has established them (lit. it) out of nothing (lit. that which does not exist). For he who has no root (= the non-Gnostic) also has no fruit (= does not become aware of his true origin) but (ἀλλά) thinks to himself: "I have come into existence (in order) to perish by myself." For this reason he who does not exist at all (= he who is not in the foreknowledge of the Father) will never come into existence. What then does he (= the Father) desire that he (= the person without root) think of himself?: "I have been like the shadows and the phantoms (φαντασία) of the night" (= have not really existed). Then the light illuminated the terror which that (man) had received, he (= that one) knows that it (= the terror) is nothing. In this way they were ignorant of the Father because

p. 29

they did not see Him. Since (ἐπειδή) it (= this ignorance) produced (lit. was) terror and disturbance and instability, doubt and strife, there were many delusions which were effected by these (manifestations just enumerated), and empty absurdities, as if they were put to sleep and found themselves disturbed by dreams: either (ἤ) (it is) a place to which they flee, or (ἤ) they are powerless when they have pursued after others; either (ἤ) they are (involved) in inflicting blows, or (ἤ) they themselves receive blows; either (ἤ) they have fallen from high places, or (ἤ) they are drawn away through the air (ἀήρ) without having any wings at all. (Other) times (it is) again as if some were killing themselves, even though there is no one pursuing after them; or (ἤ) they themselves were killing their neighbors (lit. those beside them), for they have soiled themselves with the blood of these (neighbors). Until the moment when those who have gone through all these things awake, those who have experienced all these disturbances see nothing, because these (confusing dreams) were nothing. It is also thus with those who have cast off ignorance from themselves like the sleep (and the dreams experienced while sleeping) which they consider to be nothing. They also do not (οὐδέ) think

p. 30

that the things (of this world) are real things; instead (ἀλλά), they renounce them like a dream in the night and consider the knowledge of the Father as light. It is thus that each one has acted, as if he were asleep during the time when he was ignorant, and it is (also) thus that he comes to have knowledge, as (κατά -) one who is awakening. Blessed is (lit. And it is a good thing for) the man who thus discovers (lit. comes to) himself and awakens, and blessed (μακάριος) is He (= the Father) who has opened the eyes of the blind. And the Spirit (πνεῦμα) came to him quickly in order to raise him up. When he (= Jesus) had extended his hand to the one who was stretched out on the ground, he (= the Spirit) caused him to stand on his feet, for he (= the one who is asleep in ignorance) had indeed (δέ) not yet stood up. He (= the Spirit) made accessible (lit. gave the means of knowing) to them (= the Gnostics) the knowledge from the Father and the revelation of His Son. For (γάρ) when they had seen him (= Jesus) and had heard him, he (= the Spirit) permitted (lit. gave) them to take a taste of him (= Jesus) and to smell him and to touch the beloved Son. When he had appeared to teach them concerning the illimitable Father, when he had breathed into them that which is in the thought (of the Father) while doing His will, when many had received the light, they turned

p. 31

to him (= the Father), whereas (those who were) material (ὕλη) (= the non-Gnostics) were alien (to Him) (= were not known by Him) and did not discern His form and did not come to know Him, because he (Jesus) came (only) in the likeness of flesh (σάρξ) with the result that no one (or: nothing) could block his way since it (= his flesh) is incorruptible and incoercible. Speaking again in new (words) while declaring what was in the heart of the Father, he proclaimed the faultless word. The light spoke through his mouth, and his voice produced life. He (= Christ) gave them thought and wisdom and mercy and salvation and the Spirit of power which are (derived) from the limitlessness and kindness (lit. sweetness) of the Father. He caused the punishments (κόλασις) and the scourgings (μάστιξ) to cease, for they (were) that which has caused the face of many who had need of mercy to go astray in error (πλάνη) and in chains, and he abolished them (= the forces of Error) with power and defeated them (lit. put them to shame) with knowledge. He became a way for those who were straying and knowledge for those who were ignorant, a discovery for those who were seeking, and a support for those who were trembling, (and) a purity for those who were defiled. He (= Christ) is the Shepherd who left behind the ninety-

p. 32

nine sheep which had not strayed, went in search of that one which had strayed, (and) rejoiced when he had found it. For ninety-nine is a number which is in the left hand which holds it (= the number). But (at) the moment when the one is found, the whole number passes over to the right (hand). Thus (it is also with) him who lacks the one, that is, the entire right (hand) which attracts that in which it was deficient (= 99) seizes it from the left side and transfers (it) to the right, and in this way the number becomes one hundred. The sign of that which is in their voice (= the meaning of the words) is the Father. This one worked even (κἄν) on the Sabbath (σάββατον) for the sheep which he had found after it had fallen into the pit. He saved the life of that sheep by having brought it up from the pit in order that you, the children of understanding, may know what the Sabbath (σάββατον) is, that (day) on which it is not fitting for the (work of) salvation to be idle, so that you may speak of the heavenly day (lit. the day which is above) which has no night and of the sun (lit. light) which does not set because it is perfect. Say then in your heart (= with firm conviction) that you are this perfect day and that in you dwells the light which does not fail. Speak concerning the truth to those who seek it and of knowledge to those who have committed sins in their error (πλάνη).

p. 33

Strengthen the foot of those who have stumbled, and stretch out your hands to those who are sick. Feed those who are hungry, and give rest to those who are weary. Lift up those who wish to rise, (and) awaken those who are asleep. For (γάρ) you are the wisdom which is drawn (like a sword for battle). If the strong one acts accordingly, he will become still stronger. Take heed to yourselves alone: do not busy yourselves with other (things), that is, those which you have cast away from yourselves. Do not turn back to what you have vomited forth in order to eat it. Do not permit yourselves to be eaten by moths; do not permit yourselves to be eaten by worms, for you have already shaken it (= this stage of development) off. Do not become a dwelling-place (- τόπος) for the Devil (διάβολος), because you have already destroyed him. Do not strengthen your hindrances which collapse when (ώς) we abstain from them (?). For (γάρ) the lawless man is nothing, that he may suffer oppression more than the law. For (γάρ) that one does his works because (ώς) he is lawless; but this one does his works among others because (ώς) he is righteous (δίκαιος). Therefore, do the will of the Father because you are of Him. For (γάρ) the Father is kindly (lit. sweet) and what is of His will is good. He (= the Father) has knowledge of what is yours, so that you may find your rest in them. For (γάρ) from the fruits one has knowledge of what is yours. For the children of the Father

p. 34

are his fragrance since they are from the grace of His countenance. For this reason the Father loves His fragrance and makes it manifest in every place. And if it (= the fragrance) be mixed with matter (ὕλη), He (= the Father) gives His fragrance to the light, and in His silence He (= the Father) causes it (= the fragrance) to rise above every form and every sound. For (γάρ) it is not the ears which smell the fragrance, but (ἀλλά) . . . the spirit (πνεῦμα) which has the (sense of) smelling, and it (= the spirit) draws it (= the fragrance) to itself and plunges down into the fragrance of the Father. He (= the Father) brings it (safe) to harbor and reserves it into the place from whence it came forth in the original fragrance which has become cold. It is one of a psychic (ψυχικόν) mold (πλάσμα), being like cold water that has become deficient (?), and it is on loose earth (lit. earth that is not firm), of which those who see it think that it is (solid) ground. Afterwards, it dissolves again. If a breath draws it, it becomes warm. Therefore, the cold fragrances are the result of the separation. For this reason God (?) came, abolished the separation and brought the warm fulness (πλήρωμα) of love (ἀγάπη), in order that the coldness might not again come into existence, but (ἀλλά) (in order that) the unity of perfect thought might be (realized). This (is) the word (λόγος) of the "glad tidings" (= gospel) concerning the coming of the fulness (πλήρωμα) for those who are awaiting

p. 35

the salvation which comes from above. Their hope (ἐλπίς) for which they are waiting is waiting for those whose likeness is the light in which there is no shadow. If at that time the fulness (πλήρωμα) is about to come, (then) the deficiency of matter (ὕλη) has not come into being out of the limitlessness of the Father who comes at the time of deficiency, although (καίτοι γε) no one was able to say that the Incorruptible One would come in this manner. But (ἀλλά) the depth (βάθος) of the Father expanded (lit. became many) and the thought of Error (πλάνη) was not with Him. It is a weak matter, it is a resting matter which raises itself up by finding him who has come to him whom he will lead back. For (γάρ) this return is called "repentance" (μετάνοια). For this reason Imperishability (= Christ) breathed forth (and) followed after him who had sinned, in order that he might find rest. For (γάρ) forgiveness is that which remains for the light in the deficiency, the word of the fulness (πλήρωμα). For (γάρ) the physician hurries to the place in which there is sickness, because that is the will which is in him (= because his desire compells him). Therefore, he who is suffering from a deficiency does not hide it, for he (= the physician) has that which he (= the sick man) lacks. In this manner the Pleroma (πλήρωμα) which has no deficiency fills (= overcomes) the deficiency, (the Pleroma) which he (= the Father

p. 36

has given out form Himself in order to fill (= overcome) that which he (= anyone) lacks, so that he might thus receive grace, for at the time when he was deficient, he did not have grace. For this reason inferiority prevailed in the place where there was no grace. When the little one who had need of it (= grace) was received, it appeared as a Pleroma (πλήρωμα), that is, the discovery of the light of truth, (the light) which shone forth upon him (= the one who had been newly received) because it is unchangeable. For this reason they spoke of Christ (χριστός) among themselves (lit. in their midst) in order that those who had been disturbed might receive a (way of) returning (to the Father), and (that) he (= Christ) might anoint them with the anointing. This anointing is the mercy of the Father who will have mercy upon them, and (δέ) those whom he anointed are those who are perfect. For (γάρ) it is the full jars (σκεῦος) that men are accustomed to anoint. But (δέ) as soon as the anointing of one (jar) is removed, it flows out. And the cause of its deficiency is that its anointing is withdrawn. For (γάρ) (at) that time a single breath is accustomed to fill it (= the defective vessel) through the power which is with Him (= of the Father). On the contrary (ἀλλά), concerning this one who is faultless, nothing will be sealed up with him nor (οὐδέ) will anything flow out; instead (ἀλλά), the perfect Father fills up (= overcomes) again that which is deficient in him. He (= the Father) is good (ἀγαθός) (and) He knows His seeds, for He is the One (who) has sown them in His paradise (παράδεισος), and (δέ) His paradise (παράδεισος) is His Resting-Place. This

p. 37

is the perfection in the thought of the Father, and these are the words of His reflection. Each one of His words is the work of His unique will by means of the revelation (or: appearance) of His Word (= Logos). Since they (= the Father's words) were (in the) depth (βάθος) of His thought, the Logos (λόγος) who was the first to come forth revealed (both) them (= the Father's words) and a mind (νοῦς) which speaks the unique Word (λόγος) in silent grace (χάρις). He (= the Logos) was called "the Thought" since they (= the Father's words) were in him (= the Logos) before they had been revealed. Therefore, it came to pass that he (= the Logos) was the first to come forth at the moment when the will of Him who desired (it) was willing. And (δέ) the will (is) that with which the Father satisfies himself and that which pleases Him. Nothing happens without Him, and (οὐδέ) nothing happens without the will of the Father. But (ἀλλά) His will is impenetrable. His footstep (ἴχνος) is the will, and no one will perceive it nor (οὔτε) is it so constituted that one can direct his attention to it in order to (ἵνα) understand it. But (ἀλλά) (at) the moment when He (= the Father) wills, that is what He wills (= His will remains irrevocable), even if (κἄν) the sight (of that which is created by the act of His will) does not please them (= the people), (that means) nothing before God, the will, (or) the Father. For (γάρ) He (= the Father) knows all their beginning and their end. For (γάρ) at their end he will ask them what they have done. And (δέ) the end is the receiving of knowledge about what is hidden, and (δέ) that is the Father

p. 38
from whom the beginning (= origin) has come
forth (and) to whom
all those who have come out
from Him will return, and (δέ) they became manifest
for the glory and
joy of His name.
And (δέ) the name of the Father is the Son. It is He (= the Father)
who in the beginning named the one who
came forth from Him, since he (= the Son) is (the) same
(with the Father) and (since) He (= the Father) begot him as a
Son. The Father gave him His name which
He had because it is He who possesses
all things since they exist with
Him. He has the name;
He has the Son. One is able
to see him (= the Son), but (δέ) the name
is invisible, for
it alone is the
mystery (μυστήριον) of the Invisible One
which has come to ears that are
all full of Him (= to senses that are receptive to Him). For (καὶ γάρ)
one does not speak the name of the Father,
but (δέ) it is revealed in a
son. Therefore, the name is thus great.
Who then will be able to pronounce (a) name for Him (= the Father),
this great name, except him (= the true Gnostic)
to whom the name belongs,
and the sons of the name
in whom the name of the Father
has rested (and who)
have rested themselves again (πάλιν)
in His name. Since (ἐπειδή)
the Father is unbegotten, it is He alone who
has created him (= the Son) for Himself as a name,
before He had produced the Aeons (αἰών),
in order that the name of the Father
might rule over them as
Lord, that is, the

p. 39

true name which stands firm by His command (and) by (His) perfect power. For this name is not one of (mere) words (λέξις) and His name is not appelations, but (ἀλλά) it is invisible. He (= the Father) alone named him because He alone sees it (= the name), since He alone is the One who is able to name him (= the Son). For he who does not exist (= the non-Gnostic) has no name. For (γάρ) what name will they give to him who does not exist? On the contrary, he who exists (= the true Gnostic) exists with another name of His (= the Father) and He alone knows it, and it is the Father alone who has the right (lit. ought) to name him. The Son is His name. Therefore, He has not hidden it (= the name) in the thing (named), but (ἀλλά) he was existing (there). He alone has named the Son. Therefore, the name belongs to the Father, just as the name of the Father is the Son, the compassionate (one). For (ἐπεί) where does one have a great name apart from the Father? But (ἀλλά) someone will certainly (πάντως) say to his friend: "Who will ever name the one who was existing before him, as if (ὡς) indeed his offspring do not normally receive their name

p. 40

from those who begot them?" Thus, it is fitting for us first to understand (νοεῖν) this matter, that is, what is the name? (Why?) Because his (= the Son's) is the true name. His (name) is not then the name (sent) forth from the Father (i.e. it did not actually leave the Father when he gave it to the Son), for his is that (name) which exists, (the) name Lord. Therefore, he did not receive the name as a loan like others according to (κατά) the manner in which each one is supplied with it (= the name). This (name) is rather (δέ) the Lord's name. There is none other to whom he has given it (= the name), but (ἀλλά) it (= the name) remains unnamable (and) unutterable until the time when he who alone is perfect (= the Son) uttered it, and he (alone) is the one who is able to pronounce his name and to see it. When He (= the Father) had thus decided (?) that His name should be His Son whom He desires (= His beloved Son) and when He had given the name to the one who had come forth from the Depth (βάθος), he (= the Son) spoke about His (= the Father's) hidden things, that the Father is good (lit. guileless). For this reason He (= the Father) indeed brought this one (= the Son) forth, in order that he might speak about the place (τόπος) and (about) His (the Father's) Resting-Place from which he (= the Son) had come forth

p. 41

and in order that he might glorify the Pleroma (πλήρωμα), the greatness of His (= the Father's) name, and the kindness (lit. sweetness) of the Father. He (= the Son) will speak about the place from which each individual (man) has come forth, and he (= each man) will hasten in order to return again to the place from which he had received his origin (lit. establishment) and in order to be brought away from that place - the place where he had been - because he had tasted of that place and had received nourishment and had grown (as a result of the teaching which he had received from the Son). And his own (= the Son's) Resting-Place is His (= the Father's) Pleroma (πλήρωμα). Therefore, all the emanations from the Father are "pleromas" (πληρώματα) and in all His emanations their root is in Him who has caused them all to grow forth from Himself. He has given them their destinies (lit. limits). Each one is therefore revealed, in order that out of their own thought -. For (γάρ) the place to which they send their thought, that place is their root which lifts them through all heights to the Father. They reach (lit. have) His head which is rest for them, and they are helped (lit. supported) in, if they are near to Him, so that (ὡς) they (are able to) say that they have participated in His presence (lit. face) by means of the greetings (ἀσπασμός). But (δέ)

p. 42
those of this kind (= those thus predestined) are not revealed,
for they have not risen above themselves (= no longer think of themselves as they are).
Neither (οὔτε) have they been deprived of the glory
of the Father nor (οὔτε) have they thought of Him
as (ὡς) small (= insignificant) nor (οὔτε) that he should be bitter (= harsh)
nor (οὔτε) that he should be angry (= revengeful), but (ἀλλά)
that he should be without evil (= good), unperturbed, (and)
sweet (= kind), one who knows
all (the) spaces before they came into existence and
who does not need (- χρεία) to be taught.
This is the manner of (= It is thus with)
those who have something
from above by means of the (Father's)
immeasurable Greatness, in whom they
are connected with the Unique and
Perfect (One) who exists
there for them. And they do not go down
in the underworld, neither (οὔτε) do they have (= know)
envy (φθόνος) nor (οὔτε)
moaning, nor (οὔτε) is there death
among them, but (ἀλλά) they rest
in Him who rests,
they have no labour nor (οὔτε)
are they entangled in the search
for truth, but (ἀλλά) they
are indeed the truth, and
the Father is in them and
they are in the Father (who is) perfect
(and) inseparable from
that which is truly Good (ἀγαθός). They
are not deficient in anything at all. Instead (ἀλλά),
they find rest by being refreshed in the
Spirit (πνεῦμα). And they will listen to their
root; they will occupy themselves with
those in whom He (= the Father) will find His root
and will do His soul (ψυχή) no harm.
This (= such) is the place (τόπος) of the
blessed (μακάριος); this is their
place (τόπος). May the remainder (= the potential Gnostics), therefore,
know in their place (τόπος) (= wherever they are) that
it is not fitting for me (= the author of the Gospel of Truth),

p. 43

after I have settled in the Resting-Place,
to say anything else (lit. another thing), but (ἀλλά)
I will remain in it (= the Resting-Place) (continually) and
will occupy myself always with the Father of
the All and (with) the true brethren,
those upon whom the love (ἀγάπη) of
the Father is poured out and among
whom (lit: in whose midst) nothing of Him (= the Father) is lacking,
those who really live
because they are in the
true and eternal life and
speak about the perfect light
which is filled with
the seed (σπέρμα) of the Father and
which is in His heart and in the
Pleroma (πλήρωμα), while
his (= the true Gnostic's) spirit (πνεῦμα) rejoices in Him
(= the Father) and glorifies
Him in whom he was (and still is),
because He (= the Father) is good and
His children are perfect and
are worthy of His name,
for (γάρ) He, the Father,
loves children of this sort.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. REFERENCE WORKS

1. General Reference

ARNDT, William R. and GINGRICH, F. Wilbur, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literatur: A Translation and Adaptation of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur, Fourth Revised and Augmented Edition, 1952*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

BARTON, D.M., ACKROYD, P. R., and HARVEY, A. E., *Bible Key Words, from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. III (Faith and Spirit of God). New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961.

BUTTRICK, G. A., *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, 4 Vols., New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

COATES, J. R., *Bible Key Words, from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. I (Love , Church, Sin, and Righteousness) and Vol. II (Lord, Gnosis, Basileia, and Apostleship). New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951 and 1958.

CRUM, W. E., *A Coptic Dictionary, Compiled with the Help of Many Scholars*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939.

HARNACK, A., *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius, Teil I: Die Überlieferung und der Bestand* (1. Aufl., 1893). 2. erweiterte Aufl. mit einem Vorwort von Kurt Aland; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1958.

——————, *A History of Dogma*, 7 Vols. (A Translation of *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 3 Bände. 3. Aufl.; Freiburg i.B.: J. C. B. Mohr, 1894). Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1895-1900.

HASTINGS, James, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, 12 Vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908-1922.

HENNECKE, E., *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*, 1. Band, *Evangelien*, herausgegeben von W. Schneemelcher. 3. Aufl.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959.

HORNER, G. *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect Otherwise Called Memphitic and Bohairic*, 4 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898-1905.

KITTEL, Gerhard and FRIEDRICH, Gerhard, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, 6 Bände. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933-1959.

LAKE, K., *The Apostolic Fathers* (*The Loeb Classical Library*), 2 Vols. London: Wm. Heinemann, 1925.

McNEILE, A. H., *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, Revised by C. S. C. Williams. Second Edition; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.

MORGENTHALER, R., *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes*. Zürich: Gotthelf Verlag, 1958.

MOULTON, W.F. AND GEDEN A.S., *A Concordance to the Greek New Testament*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897.

PAULY, A. F. von and WISSOWA, G., *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 23 Bände. Stuttgart: J. B.Metzler, 1894-1959.

SCOTT, E.F., *The Literature of the New Testament*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932.

STEGEMANN, V., *Koptische Paläographie*. Heidelberg: F. Bilabel, 1936.

TILL, Walter C., *Koptische Grammatik* (*Saïdischer Dialekt*) *mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnissen*. Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1955.

2. Festschriften

Amicitiae Corolla: A Volume of Essays Presented to James Rendel Harris on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday, edited by H. G. Wood. London: University Press, 1933.

The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube in Honor of C. H. Dodd. Cambridge: University Press, 1956.

Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum. Boston: Byzantine Institute, 1950.

Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper, edited by William Klassen and Graydon Snyder. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.

Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher zum 70. Geburtstag. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1927.

Festschrift Rudolf Bultmann zum 65. Geburtstag. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1949.

II. BOOKS

1. *General Works*

ABBOTT, Edwin A., *Johannine Vocabulary: A Comparison of the Words of the Fourth Gospel with Those of the Three*. London: A. and C. Black, 1905.

ALTHAUS, Paul, *Das sogenannte Kerygma und der historische Jesus; zur Kritik der heutigen Kerygma-Theologie*. 1. Aufl.; Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1958.

BARTSCH, H. W., *Kerygma and Myth: A Theological Debate*, 2 Vols. London: S. P. C. K., 1953 and 1962.

BELL, H.I., and SKEAT, T.C., *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel and Other Early Christian Papyri*. London: British Museum, 1935.

BÖHLIG, A., *Die griechischen Lehnwörter im sahidischen und bohairischen Neuen Testament*. München: R. Lerche, 1954.

BOISMARD, M.-É., *L'Évangile de Jean: Études et Problèmes*. Louvain: Desclée de Brouwer, 1958.

BRAUN, F.-M., *Jean le Théologien et son évangile dans l'église ancienne*. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1959.

BRÉHIER, Émile, *The Philosophy of Plotinus*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

BULTMANN, R., *Existence and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann*. New York: Meridian Books, 1960.

————, *History and Eschatology*. Edinburgh: University Press, 1957.

————, *Jesus Christ and Mythology*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.

————, *Primitive Christianity In Its Contemporary Setting*. New York: Meridian Books, 1956.

BURKITT, F. C., *The Religion of the Manichees*. Cambridge: University Press, 1925.

CORNFORD, F. MacDonald, *Plato's Cosmology: The Timaeus of Plato Translated with a Running Commentary*. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1937.

CULLMANN, O., *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1950.

DODD, C. H., According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953.

______________, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development: Three Lectures with an Appendix on Eschatology and History. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936.

______________, The Bible and the Greeks. Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.

FRANKFORT, HENRI, Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.

GARDNER-SMITH, P., St. John and the Synoptic Gospels. Cambridge: University Press, 1938.

KELLY, J. N. D., Early Christian Doctrines. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

KIRK, K.E., The Vision of God: The Christian Doctrine of the Summum Bonum. 2nd Edition; London: Longmans, 1941.

KOEP, Leo, Das himmlische Buch in Antike und Christentum: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur altchristlichen Bildersprache. Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1952.

KREBS, E., Der Logos als Heiland im ersten Jahrhundert: Ein religions- und dogmengeschichtlicher Beitrag zur Erlösungslehre. Freiburg i.Br.; Herder, 1910.

KREYENBÜHL, J., Das Evangelium der Wahrheit: Neue Lösung der johanneischen Frage 2 Bände. Berlin: C. A. Schwetschke und Sohn, 1900-1905.

LOEWENICH, W. von, Das Johannes-Verständnis im zweiten Jahrhundert. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1932.

LOISY, A. F., Le mandéisme et les origines chrétiennes. Paris: E. Nourry, 1934.

MACGREGOR, G. H. C. and MORTON, A. Q., The Structure of the Fourth Gospel. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1961.

MACQUARRIE, John, An Existentialist Theology: A Comparison of Heidegger and Bultmann. London: S. C. M. Press, 1955.

______________, The Scope of Demythologizing: Bultmann and His Critics. London: S. C. M. Press, 1960.

MAUER, Christian, Ignatius von Antiochien und das Johannesevangelium. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1949.

NUNN, H. P. V., The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel. Oxford: Alden and Blackwell, 1952.

NUNN, H. P. V., *The Fourth Gospel: An Outline of the Problem and Evidence.* London: Tyndale Press, 1946.

NYGREN, A., *Agape and Eros.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953.

OGDEN, Schubert M., *Christ Without Myth: A Study Based on the Theology of Rudolf Bultmann.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961.

OTT, Heinrich, *Geschichte und Heilsgeschichte in der Theologie Rudolf Bultmanns.* Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1955.

OWENS, H. P., *Revelation and Existence: A Study of the Theology of Rudolf Bultmann.* Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1957.

PIPER, Otto A., *God in History.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1939.

PISTORIUS, P. V., *Plotinus and Neoplatonism.* Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1952.

PUECH, H.-C., *Le Manichéisme: son fondateur, sa doctrine.* Paris: Civilisations du Sud, S.A.E.P., 1949.

REITZENSTEIN, R., *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium: Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen.* Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber, 1921.

ROBERTS, C. H., *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library.* Manchester: University Press, 1935.

ROBINSON, H. Wheeler, *Redemption and Revelation in the Actuality of History.* London: Nisbet and Co., 1942.

ROSS, David, *Plato's Theory of Ideas.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.

RUST, E., *Salvation History.* Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1963.

SANDERS, J. N., *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church: Its Origin and Influence on Christian Theology up to Irenaeus.* Cambridge: University Press, 1943.

SCHMIDT, Carl, *Der erste Klemensbrief in altkoptischer Übersetzung* (*Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, XXXII,1*). Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1908.

SCHMITHALS, W., *Die Gnosis in Korinth: Eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956.

SCHNIEWIND, J., *Evangelium: Ursprung und erste Gestalt des Begriffs Evangelium.* Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1927.

SCHNÜBE, Otto, *Der Existenzbegriff in der Theologie Rudolf Bultmanns: Ein Beitrag zur Interpretation der theologischen Systematik Bultmanns.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959.

SCHWEITZER, Albert, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. London: A. and C. Black, 1931.

SEGELBERG, E., *Masbūtā: Studies in the Ritual of Mandaean Baptism*. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells, 1958.

STEINDORFF, G., *Die Apokalypse des Elias: Eine unbekannte Apokalypse und Bruchstücke der Sophonias-Apokalypse* (*Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, II, 3a). Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1899.

STREETER, B. F., *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1924.

THOMPSON, Sir Henry Francis Herbert, *The Gospel of St. John According to the Earliest Coptic Manuscript*. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt, 1924.

THROCKMORTON, B. H., *The New Testament and Mythology*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.

WALTON, F. E., *Development of the Logos-Doctrine in Greek and Hebrew Thought*. London: Simpkin Press, 1911.

WETH, Gustav. *Die Heilsgeschichte: Ihr universeller und ihr individueller Sinn in der offenbarungsgeschichtlichen Theolgie des 19. Jahrhunderts*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1931.

WILD, John, *Plato's Theory of Man: An Introduction to the Realistic Philosophy of Culture*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1946.

WILES, Maurice F., *The Spiritual Gospel: The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church*. Cambridge: University Press, 1960.

WILSON, John A., *The Burden of Egypt: An Interpretation of Ancient Egyptian Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

ZANDEE, Jan, *The Terminology of Plotinus and of Some Gnostic Writings, Mainly the Fourth Treatise of the Jung Codex*. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut in het Nabije Oosten, 1961.

2. New Testament Commentaries

BARRETT, C. K., *The Gospel According to St. John.* London: S. P. C. K., 1956.

BERNARD, J. H., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John* (The International Critical Commentary), 2 Vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1928.

BULTMANN, R., *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (*Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, herausgegeben von H. A. W. Meyer*). 14. Aufl.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956.

CHARLES, R. H., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John with Introduction, Notes, and Indices, also the Greek Text and English Translation* (*The International Critical Commentary*), 2 Vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1920

DODD, C. H., *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: University Press, 1958.

______________, *The Johannine Epistles*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1946.

STRACHAN, R. H., *The Fourth Evangelist: Dramatist or Historian?* London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1925.

SWETE, H. B., *The Apocalypse of St. John, The Greek Text with Introductory Notes and Indices* (First Edition, 1907). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1954.

WESTCOTT, B. F., *The Epistles of St. John, The Greek Text with Notes and Essays* (First Edition, 1883). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1955.

______________, *The Gospel According to St. John, The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes*, 2 Vols. (First Edition, 1908). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1954.

3. *Johannine Theology*

BALDENSPERGER, W., *Der Prolog des vierten Evangeliums: Sein polemisch-apologetischer Zweck*. Freiburg i.Br.: J. C. B. Mohr, 1898.

BÜCHSEL, F., *Der Begriff der Wahrheit in dem Evangelium und den Briefen des Johannes* (*Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, XV, 3*). Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1911.

BULTMANN, R., *Theology of the New Testament*, 2 Vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954-1955.

BURY, R. G., *The Fourth Gospel and the Logos-Doctrine*. Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons, 1940.

CORELL, Alf, *Consummatum Est: Eschatology and Church in the Gospel of St. John*. London: S. P. C. K., 1958.

CULLMANN, O., *The Christology of the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.

DAVEY, J. Ernest, *The Jesus of St. John: Historical and Christological Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1958.

DILLERSBERGER, J., *Das Wort vom Logos: Vorlesungen über den Johannes-Prolog*. Salzburg: A. Pustet, 1935.

ELY, M. R., *Knowledge of God in Johannine Thought.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1925.

FRIELING, R., *Agape: Die göttliche Liebe im Johannes-Evangelium.* Stuttgart: Verlag Urachhaus, 1936.

GOGUEL, M., *La notion johannique de l'Esprit et ses antécédents historiques.* Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1902.

GROSSOUW, W., *Revelation and Redemption: A Sketch of the Theology of St. John.* Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1955.

HASS, Jakob, *Die Stellung Jesu zu Sünde und Sünder nach den vier Evangelien.* Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1953.

HEITMÜLLER, W., *"Im Namen Jesu": Eine sprachliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament, speziell zur altchristlichen Taufe (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, I, 2).* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1903.

HENKEL, T., *Wahrheit im Johannesevangelium und bei Luther (Betrachtungen und Texte: Schriften der Luther-Agricola Gesellschaft in Finnland, 5).* Helsinki: Akateeminen kirjakanppa, 1944.

HIRZEL, R., *Der Name: Ein Beitrag zu seiner Geschichte im Altertum und besonders bei den Griechen (Abhandlungen der sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philol.-hist. Klasse, 2).* Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1918.

HOARE, J. Gurney, *"Life" in St. John's Gospel.* London: S. P. C. K., 1901.

HOWARD, W. F., *Christianity According to St. John.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1946.

____________, *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation,* Revised by C. K. Barrett. London: Epworth Press, 1955.

JACOB, B., *Im Namen Gottes: Eine sprachliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Alten und Neuen Testament.* Berlin: S. Calvary, 1903.

KAHLEFELD, H., *Die Epiphanie des Erlösers im Johannes-Evangelium.* 1. Aufl.; Würzburg: Werkbund-Verlag, 1954.

LACHOWSKI, J., *The Concept of Redemption According to the Gospel of St. John.* Roma: Pontificum Athenaeum Angelicum de Urbe, 1958.

LEE, E. K., *The Religious Thought of St. John.* London: S. P. C. K., 1950.

LOFTHOUSE, W. F., *The Father and the Son: A Study in Johannine Thought.* London: S. C. M. Press, 1934.

LYONS, D. B., The Concept of Eternal Life in the Gospel According to St. John. Washington: Catholic University Press, 1938.

MENOUD, P. H., L'Évangile de Jean d'après les recherches récentes. Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1943.

MOFFATT, J., Love in the New Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1929.

MÜLLER, Theophil, Das Heilsgeschehen im Johannes-Evangelium: Eine exegetische Studie, zugleich der Versuch einer Antwort an Rudolf Bultmann. Zürich: Gotthelf-Verlag, 1961.

MUSZNER, Franz, ΖΩΗ : Die Anschauung vom "Leben" im vierten Evangelium unter Berücksichtigung der Johannesbriefe: Ein Beitrag zur biblischen Theologie. München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1952.

PERCY, E., Untersuchungen über den Ursprung der johanneischen Theologie, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Frage nach der Entstehung des Gnostizismus. Lund: Håkan Öhlssons Buckdruckerei, 1939.

SCHLATTER, A., Der Glaube im Neuen Testament: Eine Untersuchung zur neutestamentlichen Theologie. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1885.

SCHULZ, S., Untersuchungen zur Menschensohn-Christologie im Johannesevangelium; zugleich ein Beitrag zur Methodengeschichte der Auslegung des vierten Evangeliums. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957.

SCHWEIZER, E., Ego Eimi...Die religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft und theologische Bedeutung der johanneischen Bildreden, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage des vierten Evangeliums. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1939..

SIDEBOTTOM. E. M., The Christ of the Fourth Gospel in the Light of First-Century Thought. London: S. P. C. K., 1961.

SMITH, C. Ryder, The Bible Doctrine of Salvation: A Study of the Atonement. London: Epworth Press, 1941.

_______________, The Bible Doctrine of Sin and of the Way of God with Sinners. London: Epworth Press, 1953.

STEVENS, G. B., The Johannine Theology: A Study of the Doctrinal Contents of the Gospel and Epistles of the Apostle John. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1894.

SWETE, H. B., The Holy Spirit in the New Testament: A Study of Primitive Christian Teaching. London: Macmillan and Co., 1910.

THOMAS, J. E., The Problem of Sin in the New Testament. London: A. and C. Black, 1927.

THÜSING, W., Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium. Münster: Aschendorff, 1960.

4. Gnostic Texts

AMÉLINEAU, E. C., *Notice sur le papyrus gnostique Bruce: Texte et traduction*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1891.

BAYNES, C. A., *A Coptic Gnostic Treatise Contained in the Codex Brucianus*. Cambridge: University Press, 1933.

GIVERSEN, Søren, *Sandhedens evangelium: De gnostiscke handschrifter fra Nildalen*. København: G. E. C. Gads Forlag, 1957.

GRANT, R. M., *Gnosticism: A Source Book of Heretical Writings from the Early Christian Period*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961.

_____________ and FREEDMAN, D. N., *The Secret Sayings of Jesus*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1960.

GROBEL, K., *The Gospel of Truth: A Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel, Translated from the Coptic and Commentary*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.

GUILLAUMONT, A., PUECH, H.-C., QUISPEL, G., TILL, W. C., and 'ABD AL MASIH, Yassah, *The Gospel According to Thomas*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959.

HARVEY, W. W., *Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis Libros quinque Adversus Haereses*, 2 Vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1857.

HORNER, G., *Pistis Sophia, Literally Translated from the Coptic with an Introduction by F. Legge*. London: S. P. C. K., 1924.

LABIB, Pahor, *Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo* (Photographic Plates of the Apocryphon of John, the Gospel of Thomas, the Gospel of Philip, and the Hypostasis of the Archons), Vol. I. Cairo: Government Press, 1956.

LEIPOLDT, J. and SCHENKE, H.-M., *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften aus den Papyrus-Codices von Nag Hamadi*. Hamburg: H. Reich, 1960.

MALININE, E. M., PUECH, H.-C., and QUISPEL, G., *Evangelium Veritatis: Codex Jung f. VIII-XVI (p. 16-32)/ f. XIX-XXII (p. 37-43)*. Zürich: Racher Verlag, 1956.

_____________, *Evangelium Veritatis* (Supplementum): *Codex Jung f. XVII - f. XVIII (p. 33-36)*. Zürich: Racher Verlag, 1961.

SÄVE-SÖDERBERGH, Torgny, *Evangelium Veritatis och Thomas-evangeliet*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1959.

SCHENKE, H.-M., *Die Herkunft des sogenannten Evangelium Veritatis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959.

SCHMIDT, Carl and TILL, Walter C., Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften: Die Pistis Sophia, Die beiden Bücher des Jeû, Unbekanntes altgnostisches Werk, 1. Band. 2. Aufl.; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954.

SCHWARTZE, M. G. and PETERMANN, J. H., Pistis Sophia: opus gnosticum Valentino adiudicatum e codice manuscripto coptico Londinensi descriptum. Berlin: F. Dümmler, 1851.

TILL, Walter C., Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502 (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, V. 5). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1955.

VÖLKER, W., Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1932.

5. Gnosticism

AMÉLINEAU, E. C., Essai sur le Gnosticisme égyptien: ses développements et son origine égyptienne. Paris: E. Leroux, 1887.

BURKITT, F. C., Church and Gnosis: A Study of Christian Thought and Speculation in the Second Century. Cambridge: University Press, 1932.

CROSS, F. L., The Jung Codex: A Newly Recovered Gnostic Papyrus (Three Studies by H.-C. Puech, G. Quispel, and W. C. van Unnik, Translated and Edited by F. L. Cross). London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., 1955.

DE FAYE, Eugène, Gnostiques et gnosticisme: Étude critique des documents du gnosticisme chrétien au IIme et IIIme siècle (Ire éd., 1913). 2me. éd. augmentée; Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1925.

__________, Introduction à l'étude du gnosticisme au IIme et au IIIme siècle. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1903.

DORESSE, Jean, The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics (A Translation of Les livres secrets des Gnostiques d'Égypte. Paris: Librairie Plou, 1958). London: Hollis and Carter, 1960.

FÖRSTER, W., Von Valentin zu Herakleon: Untersuchungen über die Quellen und die Entwicklung der valentinianischen Gnosis. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1928.

GRANT, R. M., Gnosticism and Early Christianity. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

HILGENFELD, A., Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums urkundlich dargestellt. Leipzig: Fues' Verlag, 1884.

JONAS, Hans, Gnosis und spätantiker Geist, 1. Band, Die mythologische Gnosis. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1934; 2. durchgesehene Aufl., 1954. 2. Band, Von der Mythologie zur mystischen Philosophie.

Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1954.

__________, *The Gnostic Religion: The Message of the Alien God and the Beginnings of Christianity*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1958.

LEGGE, F., *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity: Being Studies in Religious History from 330 B.C. to 330 A.D.* 2 Vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1915.

LEISEGANG, Hans, *Die Gnosis*. 4. Aufl. Stuttgart: A. Kröner, 1955.

PUECH, H.-C. und QUISPEL, G., *Op Zoek naar het Evangelie der Wahrheit*. Nijmegen: G. F. Callenbach. N. V., 1954.

QUISPEL, G., *Gnosis als Weltreligion*. Zürich: Origo Verlag, 1951.

SAGNARD, F. M.-M., *La Gnose valentinienne et le témoignage de Saint Irénée*. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1947.

VAN UNNIK, W. C., *Evangelium aus dem Nilsand*: Mit einem Beitrag "Echte Jesusworte?" von Johannes B. Bauer und mit einem Nachwort "Die Edition der koptisch-gnostischen Schriften von Nag'Hammadi" von Walter C. Till. Frankfurt am Main: Scheffler, 1960.

__________, *Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings: A Preliminary Survey of the Nag Hammadi Find* (*Studies in Biblical Theology*, 30) (A Translation of *Openharingen uit Egyptisch Zand*. The Hague: Uitgeverij van Keulen N. V., 1958). London: S. C. M. Press, 1960.

WILSON, R. McL., *The Gnostic Problem: A Study of the Relations between Hellenistic Judaism and the Gnostic Heresy*. London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., 1958.

III. ARTICLES

1. *Reference Articles*

BIETENHARD, H., ὄνομα in G. Kittel's *T. W. N. T.*, 5 (1954), 242-283.

BOUSSET, W., "Gnosis, Gnostiker," Pauly-Wissowa's *R.E.*, 7 (1912), 1503-1547.

BRAUN, H., πλανάω, πλάνη in G. Kittel's *T. W. N. T.*, 6 (1959), 230-254.

BÜCHSEL, F., παραδίδωμι, παράδοσις in G. Kittel's *T. W. N. T.*, 2 (1935), 171-175.

BULTMANN, R., ἀλήθεια in G. Kittel's *T. W. N. T.*, 1 (1933), 239-251.

——————, ζάω, ζωή in G. Kittel's *T. W. N. T.*, 2 (1935), 862-877.

——————, "Faith" in *Bible Key Words*, Vol. III, Part 1 (1960), 57-100.

——————, "Gnosis" in *Bible Key Words*, Vol. II, Part 2 (1952), 1-67.

FRIEDRICH, G., εὐαγγέλιον in G. Kittel's *T. W. N. T.*, 2 (1935), 723-734.

GRUNDMANN, W., "Sin" in *Bible Key Words*, Vol. I, Part 3 (1951), 64-89.

KITTEL, G., λέγω, λόγος in G. Kittel's *T. W. N. T.*, 4 (1942), 100-140.

PIPER, Otto A., "Gospel (Message)" in G. A. Buttrick's *I. D. B.*, 2 (1962), 442-448.

——————, "Truth" in G. A. Buttrick's *I. D. B.*, 4 (1962), 713-717.

PUECH, H.-C., "Gnostische Evangelien und verwandte Dokumente" in E. Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* (1959), S. 158-271.

SCHNEIDER, J., ξύλον in G. Kittel's *T. W. N. T.*, 5 (1954), 36-40.

SCHRENK, G., πατήρ in G. Kittel's *T. W. N. T.*, 5 (1954), 966-1004.

SCHWEIZER, E., "Spirit of God" in *Bible Key Words*, Vol. III, Part 2 (1960), pp. 24-108.

SCOTT, E. F., "Gnosticism" in J. Hastings's *E. R. E.*, 5 (1912), 231-242.

——————, "Valentinianism" in J. Hastings's *E. R. E.*, 12 (1922), 572-576.

STAUFFER, E., "Love" in *Bible Key Words*, Vol. I, Part 1 (1951), pp. 45-67.

2. *Festschriften Articles*

ALBRIGHT, W. F., "Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of John" in C. H. Dodd's *Festschrift* (1956), pp. 153-171.

BARRETT, C. K., "The Theological Vocabulary of the Fourth Gospel and of the Gospel of Truth" in Otto A. Piper's *Festschrift* (1962), 210-223.

BORNKAMM, G., "Der Paraklete im Johannesevangelium" in R. Bultmann's *Festschrift* I (1949), S. 12-35.

CASEY, R. P., "Gnosis, Gnosticism in the New Testament" in C. H. Dodd's *Festschrift* (1956), pp. 52-80.

FILSON, Floyd V., "The Gospel of Life: A Study of the Gospel of John" in Otto A. Piper's *Festschrift* (1962), pp. 111-123.

PUECH, H.-C., "Les nouveaux Écrits Gnostiques découverts en Haute-Égypte (Premier inventaire et essai d'identification)" in W. E. Crum's *Festschrift* (1950), pp. 91-154.

WINDISCH, H., "Die fünf johanneischen Parakletssprüche" in A. Jülicher's *Festschrift* (1927), S. 110-137.

______________, "Jesus und der Geist im Johannes-Evangelium" in J. R. Harris's *Festschrift* (1933), S. 303-318.

3. General Articles

BULTMANN, R., "The Historicity of Man and Faith" in *Existence and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann* (New York: Meridian Books, 1960), pp. 92-110.

______________, "New Testament and Mythology" in H. W. Bartsch, *Kerygma and Myth: A Theological Debate*, Vol. I (London: S. P. C. K., 1953), pp. 1-44.

GIBLET, J., "Jésus et 'le Père' dans le IV^{e} Évangile" in M. É. Boismard, *L'Évangile de Jean* (1958), pp. 111-130.

PUECH, H.-C., "The Jung Codex and Other Gnostic Documents from Nag Hammadi" in F. L. Cross, *The Jung Codex* (1955), pp. 11-34.

QUISPEL, G. and PUECH, H.-C., "Der Codex Jung," *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, 15. November, 1953, Sonntagsausgabe, No. 2708, Blatt 4; 16. November, 1953, Morgenausgabe, No. 2716, Blatt 4 und Abendausgabe, No. 2724, Blatt 12.

QUISPEL, G., "L'Évangile de Jean et la Gnose" in M.-É. Boismard, *L'Évangile de Jean* (1958), 197-208.

______________, "The Jung Codex and Its Significance" in F. L. Cross, *The Jung Codex* (1955), pp. 35-78.

VAN UNNIK, W. C., "The 'Gospel of Truth' and the New Testament" in F. L. Cross, *The Jung Codex* (1955), pp. 79-129.

______________, "Het kortgeleden outdekte 'Evangelie der Waarheid' en het Nieuwe Testament," *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie* *van Wetenschappen*, *Afd. Letterkunde*, Nieuwe Recks, Deel 17, No. 3. Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maaschappij, 1954.

4. *Review Articles*

GRANT, R. M., "Review Article of H. Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*," *J. T. S.*, 7 (1956), 308-313.

GROBEL, K., "Review of R. M. Grant, *Gnosticism*," *Rel. L.*, 31 (1962), 484.

HAENCHEN, Ernst, "Besprechung von F. L. Cross, *The Jung Codex*," *Z. Kg.*, 67 (1955), 151-155.

ISENBERG, W. W., "Review of K. Grobel, *The Gospel of Truth*," *J. Rel.*, 43 (1963), 60-61.

JONAS, H., "Besprechung von M. Malinine, *Evangelium Veritatis*," *Gnom.* 32 (1960), 327-335.

LEIPOLDT, J., "Das Evangelium der Wahrheit" (Besprechung von F. L. Cross, *The Jung Codex*), *T. L. Z.*, 82 (1957), 825-834.

MONCEAUX, Paul, "Les Gnostiques" (Compte rendu de E. de Faye, *Gnostiques*), *J. Sav.*, n.s. 16 (1918), 12-26.

NOCK, A. D., "Review Article of H. Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*," *Gnom.*, 12 (1936), 605-612.

PIPER, Otto A., "Review Article of F. L. Cross, *The Jung Codex*," *T. Tod.*, 15 (1958), 131-135.

____________, "Review Article of H. W. Bartsch, *Kerygma and Myth*," *T. Tod.*, 11 (1954), 107-117.

SCHENKE, H.-M., "Besprechung von H. Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*," *T. L. Z.*, 11 (1959), 813-820.

WILLEMS, Luke, "Review Article of F. L. Cross, *The Jung Codex*," *East. Ch. Q.*, 11 (1955), 94-100.

WILSON, R. McL., "Review Article of F. L. Cross, *The Jung Codex*," *N. T. S.*, 1 (1955), 309-313.

5. *Periodical Articles*

ADAM, A., "Die gnostischen Schriften von Nag'Hammâdi," *Gnom.*, 34 (1962), 222-224.

ALEXANDER, A. B. D., "The Johannine Doctrine of the Logos," *Exp. T.*, 36 (1924/25), 394-399 and 467-472.

ASHANIN, C. B., "Toward an Understanding of Rudolf Bultmann's Theology: A Short Historical Review of German Theology," *J. Rel. T.*, 15 (1957/58), 147-154.

BACON, B. W., "The 'Other' Comforter," *Exp.*, 14 (1917), 274-282.

BARRETT, C. K., "The Gospel of Truth: The *Editio Princeps* of an Ancient Gnostic Text," *Exp. T.*, 69 (1958), 167-170.

____________, "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel," *J. T. S.*, n.s.1 (1950), 1-15.

BEARE, F. W., "New Light on the Church of the Second Century: Gnosticism and the Papyri of Nag Hammâdi: A Review Article," *Can. J. T.*, 6 (1960), 211-216.

BOWEN, C. R., "Love in the New Testament," *J. Rel.*, 13 (1933), 39-49.

BRANDT, A. J. H. W., "Ὄνομα en de Doppsformule in het Nieuwe Testament," *Th. Tijd.*, 25 (1891), 565-610.

BÜCHSEL, F., "Johannes und die Synoptiker," *Z. syst. Th.*, 4 (1926/27), 240-265.

BULTMANN, R., "Die Geschichtlichkeit des Daseins und der Glaube," *Z. Th. K.*, n. f. 11 (1930), 339-364.

____________, "Untersuchungen zum Johannesevangelium, Ἀλήθεια," *Z. N. T. W.*, 27 (1928), 113-163.

BURROWS, M., "The Origin of the Term 'Gospel'," *J. B. L.*, 44 (1925), 21-33.

BUSWELL, J. O., "The Ethics of 'Believe' in the Fourth Gospel," *Bib. Sac.*, 80 (1952), 28-37.

CASEY, R. P., "The Study of Gnosticism," *J. T. S.*, 36 (1935), 45-60.

CERFAUX, Lucien, "De Saint Paul à l'Évangile de la Vérité," *N. T. S.*, 5 (1959), 103-112.

CHADWICK, G. A., "Asking in Christ's Name," *Exp.*, 3 (1887), 191-198.

COLPE, Carsten, "Die gnostische Gestalt des Erlösten Erlösers," *Isl.*, 32 (1956), 195-214.

CRAMER, M., "Zur Deutung des Ausdruckes 'Gnosis' im Evangelium Veritatis," *S. B. O.*, 3 (1958), 48-56.

CULLMANN, O., "Der johanneische Gebrauch doppeldeutiger Ausdrücke als Schlüssel zum Verständnis des vierten Evangeliums," *T. Z. Bas.*, 4 (1948), 360-372.

DE CANTANZARO, C. J., "The Gospel According to Philip," *J. T. S.*, 13 (1962), 35-71.

DINKLER, Erik, "Existentialist Interpretation of the New Testament," *J. Rel.*, 32 (1952), 87-96.

DUNN, W., "What Does 'Gospel of Truth' Mean?", *Vig. Chr.*, 15 (1961), 160-164.

FILSON Floyd V., "The Gnostic 'Gospel of Truth'," *B.A.*, 20 (1957), 76-78.

____________, "New Greek and Coptic Gospel Manuscripts," *B. A.*, 24 (1961), 1-18.

FREY, J., "Le concept de vie dans Saint Jean," *Bib.*, 1 (1920), 38-58 et 213-239.

GÄRTNER, B., "Evangelium Veritatis och Nya Testamentet," *Rel. Bib.*, 17 (1958), 54-70.

GIVERSEN, Søren, "Evangelium Veritatis and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *St. T.*, 13 (1959), 87-96.

GRANT, F. C., "Was the Author of John Dependent upon the Gospel of Luke?" *J. B. L.*, 56 (1937), 285-307.

GRANT, R. M., "The Mystery of Marriage in the Gospel of Philip," *Vig. Chr.*, 15 (1961), 129-140.

HATCH, W. H. P., "The Primitive Christian Message," *J. B. L.*, 58 (1934), 1-13.

HERBERG, W., "Biblical Faith as *Heilsgeschichte*: The Meaning of Redemptive History in Human Existence," *Chr. Schol.*, 39 (1956), 25-31.

HUBY, J., "De la connaissance de foi dans Saint Jean," *Rech. Sc. Rel.*, 2 (1931), 385-421.

JANNARIS, A. N., "St. John's Gospel and the Logos," *Z. N. T. W.*, 2 (1901), 13-25.

JONAS, H., "Gnosticism and Modern Nihilism," *So. Re.*, 19 (1952), 430-452.

____________, "Origenes' ΠΕΡΙ ΑΡΧΩΝ - ein System patristischer Gnosis," *T. Z. Bas.*, 4 (1948), 101-119.

____________, "Die origenistische Spekulation und die Mystik," *T. Z. Bas.*, 5 (1949), 24-45.

KÜMMEL, W. G., "Der Glaube im Neuen Testament," *Th. Bl.*, 16 (1938), 209-221.

____________, "Textkritik und Textgeschichte des Neuen Testaments, 1914-1937," *T. Ru.*, N. F. 10 (1938), 293-327.

KUHN, K. G., πειροσμός, ἁμαρτία, σάρξ im Neuen Testament," *Z. Th. K.*, 49 (1952), 200-222.

LAGRANGE, M. J., "Vers le Logos de St. Jean," *R. Bib.*, 32 (1923), 161-184 et 321-371.

LOFTHOUSE, W. F., "Fatherhood and Sonship in the Fourth Gospel," *Exp. T.*, 43 (1931/32), 442-448.

MARROU, H. I., "L'Évangile de Vérité et la diffusion du comput digital dans l'antiquité," *Vig. Chr.*, 12 (1958), 98-103.

McCAUGHEY, J. D., "The Gnostic Gospel of Truth and the New Testament," *Aust. B. R.*, 6 (1958), 87-108.

MENOUD, P. H., "La foi dans l'Évangile de Jean," *Cah. Bib.*, 1 (1936), 27-43.

MERLIER, O., "Ὄνομα et ἐν ὀνόματι dans le quatrième Évangile," *Rev. Et. Gr.*, 47 (1934), 180-204.

MOODY, Dale, "God's Only Son: The Translation of John 3:16 in the Revised Standard Version," *J. B. L.*, 72 (1953), 213-219.

NEWBOLD, W. R., "Bardaisan and the Odes of Solomon," *J. B. L.*, 30 (1911), 161-204.

NOCK, A. D., "A Coptic Library of Gnostic Writings," *J. T. S.*, 9 (1958), 314-324.

PIPER, Otto A., "Change of Perspective: Gnostic and Canonical Gospels," *Interpr.*, 16 (1962), 402-417.

____________, "The Origin of the Gospel Pattern," *J. B. L.*, 78 (1959), 115-224.

____________, "Unchanging Promises: Exodus in the New Testament," *Interpr.*, 11 (1957), 3-22.

POPE, R. M., "Faith and Knowledge in Pauline and Johannine Thought," *Exp. T.*, 41 (1929/30), 421-427.

PREUSCHEN, E., "Anmerkung" in H. Gunkel, "Die Oden Salomos," *Z. N. T. W.*, 11 (1910), 291-328.

PUECH, H.-C. et QUISPEL, G., "Le quatrième écrit gnostique du Codex Jung," *Vig. Chr.*, 9 (1955), 65-102.

QUECKE, H., "Eine weitere Seite der koptisch-gnostischen 'Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Welt'," *Mus.*, 72 (1959), 349-353.

QUISPEL, G., "Christliche Gnosis und jüdische Heterodoxie," *Ev. T.*, 14 (1954), 474-484.

____________, "La conception de l'homme dans la gnose valentinienne," *Eranos-Jahrbuch*, 15 (1947), 249-286.

QUISPEL, G., "Der gnostische Anthropos und die jüdische Tradition," *Eranos-Jahrbuch*, 22 (1953), 195-234.

______________, "Het Johannesevangelium en de Gnosis," *Ned. T. Ts.*, 11 (1957), 173-203.

RINGGREN, H., "Evangelium Veritatis och den valentinianska gnosis," *Rel. Bib.*, 17 (1958), 41-53.

SASSE, H., "Der Paraklet im Johannesevangelium" *Z. N. T. W.*, 24 (1925), 260-277.

SCHAEFER, O., "Der Sinn der Rede Jesu von den vielen Wohnungen in seines Vaters Hause und von dem Weg zu ihm (John 14:1-7)," *Z. N. T. W.*, 32 (1933), 210-217.

SCHELKLE, K. H., "Das Evangelium Veritatis als kanongeschichtliches Zeugnis," *B. Z.*, 5 (1961), 90-91.

SCHENKE, H.-M., "Das Evangelium nach Philippus: Ein Evangelium der Valentinianer aus dem Funde von Nag-Hamadi," *T. L. Z.*, 84 (1959), 1-26.

______________, "Die fehlenden Seiten des sogenannten Evangeliums der Wahrheit," *T. L. Z.*, 83 (1958), 497-500.

______________, "Vom Ursprung der Welt: Eine titellose gnostische Abhandlung aus dem Funde von Nag-Hamadi," *T. L. Z.*, 84 (1959), 243-256.

______________, "Das Wesen der Archonten: Eine gnostische Originalschrift aus dem Funde von Nag Hammadi," *T. L. Z.*, 83 (1958), 661-670.

SCHMIDTKE, E., "Zum Evangelium Veritatis 36, 17ss: ['Gesalbte Gefässe']," *T. L. Z.*, 85 (1960), 713-714.

SCHOEDEL, W. R., "New Gnostic Papyri," *Rel. L.*, 31 (1961/62), 99-107.

SCHULZ, S., "Die Bedeutung neuer Gnosisfunde für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft," *T. Ru.*, 26 (1960), 333-334.

SCHWEIZER, E., "The Spirit of Power: The Uniformity and Diversity of the Concept of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament," *Interpr.*, 6 (1952), 259-278.

SEGELBERG, E., "The Coptic-Gnostic Gospel According to Philip and its Sacramental System," *Num.*, 7 (1960), 189-200.

______________, "Evangelium Veritatis: A Confirmation Homily and its Relation to the Odes of Solomon," *Or. Suec.*, 8 (1959), 3-42.

STÖLTEN, W., "Gnostische Parallelen zu den Oden Salomos," *Z. N. T. W.*, 13 (1912), 29-58.

THIELICKE, H., "Reflections on Bultmann's Hermeneutic," *Exp. T.*, 67 (1956), 154-157.

THOMSON, P., "'Know' in the New Testament," *Exp.*, 9th Series, 3 (1925), 379-382.

TILL, Walter C., "Bemerkungen zur Erstausgabe des 'Evangelium Veritatis'," *Or.*, n.s. 27 (1958), 269-286.

———, "Das Evangelium der Wahrheit: Neue Übersetzung des vollständigen Textes," *Z. N. T. W.*, 50 (1959), 165-185.

———, "The Gnostic 'Apocryphon of John'," *J. E. H.*, 3 (1952), 14-22.

———, "Die Kairener Seiten des 'Evangeliums der Wahrheit'," *Or.*, n.s. 28 (1959), 170-185.

TORM, Frederich, "Das Wort γνωστικός," *Z. N. T. W.*, 35 (1936), 70-75.

WILSON, R. McL., "The Gnostic Library from Nag'Hammadi," *Scot. J. T.*, 12 (1959), 161-170.